THE LIVING AGE

CONTENTS

for July 1, 1930

Articles

LABOR'S FIRST YEAR ..... *J. L. Garvin* 512
MESSAGE FROM INDIA ..... *Rabindranath Tagore* 518
EUROPE'S NEXT PHASE ..... *Hans Zehrer* 521
HOW ABOUT SOCIALISM?
I. SOCIALISTS IN THE SADDLE ..... *Henri de Kerillis* 525
II. THE LIMITS OF SOCIALISM ..... *A Labor Editor* 531
FROM WASHINGTON TO LONDON ..... *Jacques Bardoux* 536
RIVALRY IN AFRICA ..... *Arnold Höllriegel* 540
GERMANY GOES AMERICAN ..... *Theodor Lüddecke* 544
BRIAND FOR EUROPE ..... *Wladimir d'Ormesson* 549
WHY I LEFT THE FILMS ..... *Emil Jannings* 554

Departments

THE WORLD OVER 505
LETTERS AND THE ARTS 558
AS OTHERS SEE US 561
CORRESPONDENCE 564

THE LIVING AGE. Published semi-monthly, on the first and the fifteenth of each month. Publication office, 10 FERRY STREET, CONCORD, N. H. Editorial and General offices, 253 Broadway, New York City. 25c a copy. $6.00 a year. Foreign postage, except Canada, $1.00. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Concord, N. H., under the Act of Congress, March 3, 1879.
Copyright, 1930, by The Living Age Company, New York, New York.

THE LIVING AGE was established by E. Littell, in Boston, Massachusetts, May, 1844. It was first known as LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, succeeding *Littell's Museum of Foreign Literature*, which had been previously published in Philadelphia for more than twenty years. In a prepublication announcement of LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, in 1844, Mr. Littell said: 'The steamship has brought Europe, Asia, and Africa into our neighborhood; and will greatly multiply our connections as Merchants, Travelers, and Politicians, with all parts of the world: *so that much more than ever, it now becomes every intelligent American to be informed of the condition and changes of foreign countries.*'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GUIDE POST

OUR CONFIDENCE in the long-standing policy of THE LIVING AGE in placing emphasis upon articles designed to keep our readers in close touch with the viewpoints of other nations, and especially such as tend to bring the problems of our friends across seas to the sympathetic attention of the American public, has had gratifying confirmation in a recent letter from Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior of the United States. '. . . A definite interlocking of the world's economic, social, and political interests,' writes Secretary Wilbur in part, 'is well on its way. Vital in this process is the understanding of the peoples of one nation by those of another. Since this is impossible to bring about to any degree by personal contact, such a magazine as THE LIVING AGE is of the greatest value.' Mr. Wilbur's letter appears in full in our correspondence department elsewhere in this number.

WE HAVE sometimes felt, in this connection, that the underlying objectives of THE LIVING AGE of which Secretary Wilbur speaks might be even more effectively accomplished if we could make a more complete coverage of the foreign field in a single issue. Mr. Clarence M. Lewis, formerly counsel for the New York Transit Commission and a legal author of distinction, is the latest of many correspondents to make this suggestion, which would involve a change from a semimonthly to a monthly publication date. His letter appears in full in the correspondence columns elsewhere in this number.

BRITISH Socialism, which in the form of the Labor Party has now enjoyed over a year's good run for its money in Parliament, comes in for a generous shower of brickbats and bouquets in this issue. MR. GARVIN, writing this time, in LABOR'S FIRST YEAR, as editor of the London *Observer* rather than in his more august function as British editor of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, has a lot to say about whoops, tomahawks, unemployment, and free trade. He leaves his readers with a pretty picture of Mr. MacDonald's ship of state, all pennants fluttering in a breeze of oratory, bearing down upon economic shoals about which play innumerable sharks with large, Conservative heads. In the first section of the debate, HOW ABOUT SOCIALISM?, HENRI DE KERILLIS, the brilliant French conservative journalist, tells how he went to London and found the Labor Government all tangled up with Indians, Arabians, Egyptians, Hebrews, and unbalanced budgets. He draws the conclusion that, whereas British labor has plenty of Conservative arms to fall into should it weary of Labor control, French labor lacks an attractive conservative party. His opponent, one of the Labor editors of the *New Statesman*, then proceeds to make out a neat case for optimism in Great Britain. The impression one gets from all three articles is that economic problems have now achieved almost overwhelming importance in the life of nations, and consequently in their relations with each other.

THE silent men in gray business suits who reach the international, economic, and financial agreements of to-day can do their work behind closed doors and do it well. What happens when the inevitable smiles and gold braid of diplomacy follow after them to turn their expert agreements into public and political facts? HANS ZEHRER, in EUROPE'S NEXT PHASE, compares the shift from business suits to frock coats which followed the Dawes Plan with that which is now following the Young Plan. His opinion as to the difference of atmosphere in which the two changes took place is instructive for anyone who has followed—as who has not?—the series of post-War efforts to stabilize European politics.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE'S appeal to the West, MESSAGE FROM INDIA, seems to us to catch and fix in plain English a notion which many politicians apparently find it difficult even to conceive: the conception that a strong nation, to fulfill its proper function

(*Continued on page 566*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LIVING AGE

Founded by E. Littell

In 1844

July 1, 1930 *Volume 338, Number 4365*

The World Over

CONTINUAL DROPPING of water wears away a stone and though M. Briand's plan for a federated Europe has not yet caught hold, each time he brings the subject up he makes a measurable advance. His recent memorandum, coming as it did on the same day that the Young Plan went into effect and that the French troops started evacuating the Rhineland, will at least serve to mark the beginning of a new era. Two articles in this issue—one by Hans Zehrer, who points out that politicians are again following financiers in the reconstruction of Europe, and the other by a Frenchman who is perhaps inclined to overestimate M. Briand's chances of success—help to put the memorandum in its proper setting. But with all due respect to the French foreign minister's high-mindedness we find it hard to believe that he is pursuing a purely idealistic course—indeed he would be foolish to attempt to do so. The work of 'organizing the peace of Europe' to which he so often refers actually means consolidating the present French preponderance in such a way that the new forces—notably Fascist Italy and rationalized republican Germany—will be able to develop more freely. In other words, the French must make up their minds to certain compromises in North Africa and Poland, but the general conciliatory policy of which these compromises would form a part should prove more beneficial than Poincaré's strong-arm methods in the Ruhr, whose inevitable collapse ended by threatening France with bankruptcy.

Furthermore, M. Briand's conception is a comparatively modest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one. *Le Temps*, his semi-official mouthpiece, interprets his aims as follows:—

> The idea is clear. It is not at all a question of improvising a United States of Europe, which would be an extremely dangerous enterprise with the Old World in its present condition; it is merely a matter of establishing a permanent contact between the nations of the Continent so that they may be able to pass common resolutions when circumstances require. It is not a question of systematically building up the political unification of Europe, but of coördinating efforts, conciliating interests, and reaching an understanding which will enable each state to face more solidly the necessities that are equally imperious to all nations on our continent. Within this field, such a conception perhaps has political as well as economic possibilities that are worth studying with the closest attention.

The project met with a varied reception in the foreign press. Italy greeted it with complete silence, although her representative at Geneva had stated last September in the name of his Government that there was no reason why M. Briand's proposition should not be studied. England, too, remained disappointingly aloof, a leading editorial in the London *Times* having arrived at this conclusion:—

> At a time when the loosening of the legal and formal bonds between the self-governing parts of the British Empire has become complete, the first task of its statesmen must be to secure the constant collaboration needed if it is to endure and prosper. They cannot engage in enterprises which, however laudable in themselves, might conflict with that main task, and, as was so plainly shown during the naval negotiations, British opinion both in this country and in the dominions is firmly set against any entanglement in Europe which could commit any member of the Empire to indefinite and unforeseen responsibilities. But, with that reservation, there can be no doubt of our earnest support of every endeavor to lower the barriers, political and economic, which now separate the nations of Europe and to facilitate effective coöperation between them.

The German press responded more cordially. *Germania*, organ of the Centre Party to which Chancellor Brüning belongs, feels that the document was addressed primarily to the Reich:—

> No reply is being awaited so eagerly by the Quai d'Orsay as the one from Berlin. France holds out her hand to Germany and offers a new guarantee to place beside the economic agreements that have already been made and the obligations that have already been assumed. Everyone on our side of the frontier feels that with the evacuation of the Rhineland a new era in Franco-German policy is beginning, but this era cannot open with a fresh act of German submission. It must start with a Franco-German agreement concerning the regulation of future questions.

Meanwhile Poland, terrified by the prospect of a German attack on the Danzig Corridor, looks askance at any project approved of in Berlin. The *Gazeta Warszawska* makes this comment:—

> Clearly the problem of a European union should be treated by each country from the point of view of its own interests. If France has taken the initiative it is because France is trying to put through the maximum of international guaran-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tees in order to assure peace in Europe and specifically to protect her own eastern frontier, which will again be left open after the Rhineland evacuation. As for Germany, her view of this question will be determined by what opportunities it will offer her to revise her frontiers with Poland. And when we consider that Poland will in consequence be forced to look at this same problem from the same point of view but in a diametrically opposite spirit, we can realize how difficult it will be to conciliate opposites and to increase the solidity of Europe without creating a new piece of fiction.

ENGLAND AND AMERICA may have much in common but they certainly respond differently to emergencies. With 3.8 per cent of Great Britain's population out of work, the London press announces that conditions will be worse before they are better and prophesies that the number of the unemployed will rise to two millions before the year is over. Meanwhile, in the United States, with 4.8 per cent of the population out of work, Mr. Hoover proclaims that we have turned the corner and the press of the country agrees with him. But British pessimism and American optimism have this in common—each produces its opposite. The stock market replies to Mr. Hoover's good cheer by dropping some twenty points, while the gloom of England does not entirely conceal certain signs of fundamental prosperity. Indeed, the British have become such masters at the art of self-depreciation that the following passage from the London *Statist* is perhaps even more interesting from the psychological than from the factual point of view:—

Nowhere in the industrial sphere is there to be found any substantial promise of alleviation from the present industrial gloom. The coal-mining industry is succeeding in recapturing some of its former external markets, but even here the position remains depressed and no less than 178,000 miners, representing nearly 17 per cent of the insured persons engaged in the industry, are wholly unemployed. Employment in the iron and steel industry continues to decline and the latest figures show that over 30 per cent of the insured workpeople in this industry are out of work. The position in the shipbuilding industry remains very bad. Shipyards in the west of England are steadily discharging more men and in Wales no less than 50 per cent of the insured workpeople engaged in this industry are unemployed. About 180,000 operatives, or one-third of the insured persons employed in the cotton industry, are now wholly out of work, while of the remaining two-thirds an appreciable proportion is working short time. In the wool textile industry employment has been seriously affected by the suicidal dispute which began in the second week of April and which is still being waged with a grim determination. Disregarding those disqualified from unemployment benefit by reason of this dispute, the number of persons unemployed in the woolen industry account for about 22 per cent of the total insured workpeople. This ratio is slightly more than double that which obtained a year ago. And so the sorry tale of depression and unemployment continues throughout well nigh the whole of industry.

Here is a mark for the guiding geniuses of America to shoot at if they would emulate the British technique of lulling competitors into a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state of false security. For in spite of all her own asseverations to the contrary, England still remains supremely powerful. The Economic Section of the League of Nations has issued a *Memorandum on International Trade and Balances of Payments, 1926–28*, which the London *Economist* refers to as 'one of the most satisfactory symptoms of the diffusion of economic knowledge' since it illustrates 'the steady transference of public interest from the merchandise balance of trade to the balances, visible and invisible, of payments.' The chief revelation this volume contains is that during 1928 the United Kingdom received a favorable balance of interest and dividends of $1,387,000,000 as against $683,000,000 for the United States. Without meaning to belittle the industrial crisis in Great Britain, we call attention to these figures as the best explanation we have seen of why that country still runs more smoothly than any other.

SIR OSWALD MOSLEY'S resignation from the British Cabinet brought about a brief Parliamentary crisis, and the commotion that he caused indicates that he is probably a leader in the making. Harold Laski, writing in the Laborite *Daily Herald*, says of Sir Oswald:—

> He has obviously great qualities. As a speaker, he has real charm and rhetorical gifts of a very high order. He knows how to debate; and he has the manner of the man born to play a part in the House of Commons. He has more than the gift of eloquence. He has courage and energy and enthusiasm. It took courage to cross the floor of the House; it took courage to risk his career by resigning from the Government. Anyone who has seen Mosley at work during an election realizes that he knows how to work. If he does not spare others, certainly, also, he does not spare himself. He organizes himself for the end he has in view with a relentless vigor it is impossible not to admire.

Ambition and lack of balance, however, may play him false:—

> He has made the mistake now of assuming an indispensability he does not possess. He has done it, no doubt, in the grand manner, and with high courage. Yet the first lesson a Socialist politician must learn is that no one is indispensable in our ranks. A patient humility is the parent of creativeness. Ambition is best realized when it is most forgotten.

The *Morning Post*, at the other end of the political scale, offers a more cynical explanation of Sir Oswald's conduct:—

> When Sir Oswald allowed the rising star of his career to be associated with the question of unemployment, he made one of his few mistakes, and he has lost as little time as decency would allow in rectifying it. He saw some time ago—and, indeed, it was apparent to more obtuse intellects—that the line taken by his principal was going to be unpopular. For Mr. J. H. Thomas refused to make it popular. He obstinately rejected various schemes for promoting national bankruptcy under the guise of increasing employment. And when Mr. Thomas became unpopular, a promising career was placed in peril by the association.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The same leading editorial in which this comment appears ends with an amusing slam at the Labor Party. Mr. George Lansbury, the First Commissioner of Works, who signed Sir Oswald's protest against the Government's slack unemployment policy but did not resign from office, recently made a statement in Parliament which the *Post* takes as a typical piece of Socialist reasoning:—

> 'Personally,' said Mr. Lansbury, 'I have no feeling whatsoever against machinery, but I have always said that work is a curse. . . . None of us wants to go to manual labor. I ran away from it myself at the earliest possible moment. None of us wants to go back to it; I certainly do not.'
>
> A commissioner of works who objects to work; a 'labor leader' who seeks refuge from labor in office—there we have in candid epitome the whole meaning and explanation of Socialism and the Labor Party. Why should anybody work —as long as there is anything in the Treasury? And why should they resign—as long as there is a Government? Such are the great principles over which Mr. Lansbury and Sir Oswald Mosley part company.

BY EMPHASIZING the dark side of many situations and by encouraging alarmist reports of every description, the journalists of Europe have helped to convince the outside world—and the United States in particular—that their continent breeds nothing but trouble. We take pleasure, therefore, in pointing, for a change, to a cheerful piece of news and drawing the attention of our readers to the treaty of friendship, nonaggression, coöperation, and arbitration signed in Prague between Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia. Scarcely a dozen years ago the Czechs broke into open revolt against their Austrian leaders, on whose side Bulgaria had entered the World War. Furthermore, Czechoslovakia has since that time consistently championed the new European frontiers, which have hemmed Bulgaria within narrow limits. Yet in spite of wartime and post-War differences the two nations have now come together in a pact of which the *Journal de Genève* says, 'The League of Nations has registered an imposing number of treaties of arbitration, but few of them are as important as the one to which Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia have just adhered.'

CAROL'S RETURN to the Rumanian throne brings to an end the political domination of the Brătianu family, who played a decisive part in getting their country to enter the War on the side of the Allies and who cultivated the closest friendship with France until the Liberal Party, which they dominated, fell from power nearly two years ago. At that time Ion Brătianu, the Premier, had just died and his brother, Vintilă, who succeeded him, has now entirely lost control of the party, which has swung around to support the new King. Whether this col-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lapse of the Brătianu dynasty—which includes the conversion of Ion's son George to the cause of Carol—also means that Italian influence has triumphed over French remains to be seen. The first comments in *Le Temps* concerning Carol's *coup d'état* revealed a thinly disguised hostility, but this may have been due to real concern for the future of Rumania under his uncertain hand.

The king business is also booming in Hungary. Archduke Albrecht, a Hapsburg and a former claimant to the Iron Crown of Saint Stephen, has pledged allegiance to his young kinsman Otto, who will be twenty-one in November, when the question of his relieving Admiral Horthy of the Regency should come to a head. Indeed, royalty is an even more popular institution in Hungary than in Rumania, and since a Hapsburg may not be allowed to rule in Budapest, Carol has conceived the wild idea that there may be some chance for himself, as a member of the House of Hohenzollern. A united Rumanian-Hungarian kingdom would possess certain economic advantages, but it seems unlikely that popular feeling in the two countries could stand the strain.

ENGLAND'S DISPUTE with the Vatican over the activities of a pro-British priest on the island of Malta is described by a high official on the spot as being part of Italy's scheme to claim the island for herself. Sir Augusto Bartolo, Maltese Minister of Education and right-hand man of Lord Strickland, the British Governor of the island, who is himself a Roman Catholic, has made this statement:—

> Speaking with full responsibility, I say there is not a shadow of doubt that Italy has cast very hungry eyes on Malta, and that if the oft-talked-of scheme of the revival of the old Roman Empire has any meaning at all, Malta is designed as the pivot of it. It is the general idea throughout Italy that Malta is *Italia irredenta*, which is, of course, absurd, but the result of the pacific Italian penetration of Trieste should be an eye-opener to those whose duty it is to guard the great imperial fortress in the heart of the Empire's main artery and leave nothing undone to prevent the creation of such an international atmosphere as would make it possible for Italy at any time to lay claim to the island.
>
> The Maltese Ministers have done their duty to the King and the Empire and so has his Majesty's Government in London. What we claim is that there should be no conflict between our duties to the Church and to the Crown. Like that of the main architect of Catholic emancipation, whose centenary has just been held, all we claim is to take our religion from Rome and our politics from home—of course to the utter exclusion of political interference from any quarters on matters that are purely spiritual and religious.

THE ELECTION OF ALBERT KVIESIS as President of Latvia represents a conservative victory and assures the continuation of a policy of coöperation with the neighboring Baltic states rather than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with Soviet Russia. Although the Social Democratic Party holds more seats in the Parliament at Riga than any other single group, the Peasants' Union, to which the new President belongs, enjoys a sure majority through the support of other right-wing organizations. As a predominantly agricultural country, Latvia has not gone in for Communism, although agitators from Moscow are constantly active. The natural desires of its two million inhabitants are for free trade all along the Baltic from Poland to Finland, but the dispute between the former country and Lithuania and the tendency of Finland to gravitate toward the Scandinavian powers have prevented any widespread agreement. The best that can be hoped for at the moment is that the customs union between Esthonia and Latvia can be extended to include Lithuania. President Kviesis will work to this end and can count on the steady opposition of Moscow to all his efforts.

WORLD OPINION IN GENERAL and the League of Nations in particular have been repeatedly urged to sympathize with the unfortunate predicament of four million Ukrainians dwelling within the Polish frontiers. Since a good many more million Poles have for centuries suffered under even worse oppression it is only natural that such injustice should exist—indeed it is all of a piece with the seizure of Vilna from Lithuania and the ill treatment accorded to German inhabitants of the Danzig Corridor. The trouble, however, seems to be that the Ukrainians have been forced to attend Polish schools, having been denied any of their own. Their protests to the League, made in accordance with the Polish Minorities Treaty, have been blandly ignored in those rare cases when the Poles did not suppress, sidetrack, or confiscate them at the start. Indignation on the part of the Ukrainians can be readily understood and probably deserves every sympathy, but one cannot help feeling that the Poles, however shortsighted they may be here and elsewhere, cannot be blamed for continuing a tradition of oppression on which they themselves were weaned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sympathy with Mr. MacDonald's efforts for world peace does not blind the Conservative editor of the London *Observer* to the shortcomings of Labor in relation to tariffs and unemployment.

LABOR'S First Year

By J. L. GARVIN

From the *Observer*
London Moderate Conservative Weekly

ON MAY 30th last year the late Conservative régime crashed at the polls, so that over a twelvemonth has passed since Mr. Ramsay MacDonald became Prime Minister for the second time. The time has come to attempt something like a fundamental examination of Labor policy on the industrial side, and in its bearing upon the economic future of Britain. For imperial reasons Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's second administration must be stanchly supported for some considerable time. Often and fully we have paid our tributes to the achievements of the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the international sphere. By contrast, it would not be easy to imagine on the industrial side a more general disappointment.

We are the last to take a merely partisan view or to make a jaundiced indictment. The graver industrial situation is largely the misfortune of the Government as well as considerably its fault. No government could have prevented the Hatry smash or the American slump, or the subsequent world-wide depression of demand, prices, and enterprise. But on that account Conservatives, had they remained in office, would have received no quarter. Whoops, tomahawks, and scalping knives would have been the arguments of oppositions on the war path. Last year Labor and Liberalism alike promised they would reduce unemployment and nourish prosperity.

Let us see what are the facts before we come to the rival deductions. Trade is far worse. Employment is less. Unemployment has increased

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by leaps and bounds. Even in the middle of May, when such figures nearly always touch bottom, the upward slant had begun. There are over 1,700,000 persons on the idle register. From about the end of May to the opening weeks of next year the usual periodical rise must be expected. There is no dispute about this. Ministers know what everyone knows. It is extremely absurd to say that more indulgent relief has only made previous facts more visible. This factor only accounts for less than five per cent of the total. It seems pretty certain that by Christmas the unemployed will have risen to over 2,000,000 persons, largely 'on the dole' in the fullest sense, and not genuinely insured.

WHAT is the case for the Government as stated by its two most strait-laced free-importers, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the President of the Board of Trade? What is their idea of the economic outlook? What are the real probabilities? They lay the whole blame on world depression since last autumn, and they point to unemployment in other countries.

What is the truth about unemployment abroad? That France does not suffer from it is owing mainly to the strength of her protected home market. For the same reason several other European countries do not suffer from it to anything like the same degree. But we are asked to look especially at the cases of the United States and Germany. Every year both these countries, but especially the former, throw upon their labor markets a far larger increase of persons seeking work. America has to deal annually with four times as many new candidates for employment as we have to cope with in this country; Germany with twice as many. We have not a single particle of doubt that relatively to social conditions and opportunities in this country, the British figures for unemployment under the Labor Government to-day are considerably the worst in the world.

When Mr. Snowden and Mr. Graham speak of the future of world trade they talk like people who try to believe what they want to believe. They tell us in effect that cheap money by itself will presently begin to work wonders. Now, cheap money is a sign of economic low spirits. Some time is apt to elapse in these cases before it becomes again the ready instrument of confident enterprise. The initial impulse leading to a world recovery of trade cannot come from this country. America is the fly wheel of the world's economic machinery to-day, and must revolve full speed again before all the wheels can be set spinning elsewhere. Experts in the United States anticipate a revival of business in the autumn. The beneficent and indispensable effects of quickened capitalism may not do very much to help our Labor Government until next spring. Mr. Snowden's budget, as he will find, tends to retard the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

energy of enterprise in this country. While practising refrigeration, he preaches optimism. He cannot have it both ways.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, the President of the Board of Trade, and their Liberal chorus seek to revive familiar delusions about the future of tariffs abroad. The truth is that nowhere in the world is there an effective movement nor any sign of one for real free trade. The new American tariff, no doubt, is the very climax of exaggerated protection. The growth of that system has reached its utmost height at last, and a strong reaction seems certain. But any abatement in the next few years will still leave the system at a high level. Free trade in our sense has been abandoned alike by Democrats in the United States and by Canadian Liberals, as well as by every important party in every other dominion. The practical issue nearly everywhere outside this country is merely whether the tariff shall be higher or lower. India and China, with their enormous populations,—comprising together not very much less than half the human race,—are only at the beginning of high protection on the American model.

THERE is no genuine free trade issue anywhere. And for this, especially in Europe, there is a reason which our orthodox Brahmans might begin to understand if they would consider biology as well as economics—the whole life of nations no less than one theory of the wealth of nations. For instance, why chiefly is France 'indissolubly wedded to protection,' as one of her experts recently declared without danger of contradiction? Because half her people still live on the soil they love, and cultivate that kind of wealth as well as every other kind. Neither Germany nor any other great country will ever make the same sacrifice of its agriculture that we have made of ours. With them, to preserve the strongest roots of national breed and character—in addition to the surest form of continuing wealth—is more important than to make at one given period the largest amount of temporary money while injuring their deepest and most permanent assets.

In the long run nothing on earth can compensate any people for reducing its rural breed to a minimum, while multiplying its town population blindly, at haphazard, beyond reason and without any process of reason. We have packed six-sevenths of our people into the streets. We have only a seventh on the land; and after years of argument about it we cannot make up our minds even yet to stop the decline. Nothing like this has ever been seen in the world before. All this has been done without any regard whatever to any pattern or ideal of national life as a whole. It has been done in the name of the free-importing dogma, without any real insight into physical, intellectual, or spiritual consequences —or even into the ultimate economic consequences.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But we are told that Labor and the Bank of England together will save us by 'rationalization' alone. Let us see. The process in view is a great and indispensable reform. We rejoice in the initiative of Mr. J. H. Thomas and in the potent aid of Mr. Montagu Norman. But Lord Melchett has been the practical pioneer of rationalizing in this country. He knows all about it. And he knows about it something to which Mr. Snowden is blind. What does the process imply? It means complete efficiency in equipment and organization. It eliminates inferior plant, overlapping, suicidal rivalries between smaller concerns. It cuts out every kind of waste and all superfluous costs.

But also, as Lord Melchett knows from manufacturing practice, there is another factor, and it makes all the difference. Everywhere else rationalized systems work inside tariff systems. They command their home markets. By excluding the uncertain factor of competitive imports, they can plan ahead and calculate for a larger output by comparison with their British rivals. The larger your output by comparison with your overhead charges, the lower the cost of production.

THIS is the vital factor. Unless you secure it, you try to stage *Hamlet* while leaving out the Prince of Denmark. The old theoretical chip-chop arguments for and against free imports are only fit for the scrap heap. They have no relevance to modern working conditions. Any competitive nation depending on machine industry must make the very best of its machine power. The real secret is full running with maximum output. This is the only way to secure what the Labor Government, like everyone else, sees to be necessary—to reduce costs without reducing wages. But on the doctrinaire principles of our Chancellor of the Exchequer and our President of the Board of Trade, rationalizing, in spite of its expense, is to be prevented in this country from achieving full equality of conditions. We are still to keep our production lower by comparison with capacity, and our costs higher in proportion to output, for the sake of continuing the free import of competing foreign manufacture from countries which still refuse us corresponding free sale.

No dogmatic free-importer and anti-safeguarder seems to understand the practical meaning of overhead charges in manufacturing industry. Where margins of profit are small, our manufacturers and their work people are hopelessly disabled by comparison with their foreign competitors, who pay lower wages, whose taxation is only half as much, whose costs of production are relatively cheaper than ever before, and who suppress our fair chance in their own markets while enjoying free access to ours. Our system acts more and more like a British bounty to the foreign article, and like a British ban on the home article. The system amounts to increasing privilege for foreign labor, and to increas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing discrimination against British labor. Especially in iron and steel, but in other trades also, the addition of the amount we now import to the output of our home plant would make all the difference between expansion and depression, stability and jeopardy, profit and loss. To spread the overhead charges over a larger output is as necessary in the interest of labor as of capital. Without this we never can achieve what every school of economic opinion, excluding some reactionary or fatalistic employers, holds to be vital—reduction of total costs without reduction of wages.

It is not easy for a scrutinizing mind to see how rationalizing in this country, while deprived by free imports of equal facilities for high output and low costs, can expect to achieve equal success.

These are our reasons for believing that the greatest economic problem of its kind that ever confronted this or any nation never can be solved on Mr. Snowden's lines, and that before his next budget a crisis he little imagines will confront him and the Cabinet. Mr. J. M. Keynes recently wrote a very remarkable article in the *Nation*. He does not share our absolute conviction that this country has reached the point where, in default of any sufficient hope of freer trade, it must have tariff equality. He gives a different diagnosis, but he agrees with us that we must all expect the number of the unemployed to rise above 2,000,000 before Christmas. The budget, like the American slump and the Hatry crash, has thrown back the hopes of Mr. J. H. Thomas. Will dearer coal help him any more than the kind of finance that penalizes enterprise and dissipates assets? We shall all know before Labor completes its second twelvemonth.

In this inquiry we are looking ahead and thinking aloud. At present no one can get usefully excited against the industrial policy of a Government which, as everyone knows, has to be kept in power for supreme reasons. Nor will the people be deeply stirred this time by abstract arguments one way or the other. All will depend upon how facts turn out. If, indeed, the unemployed are over 2,000,000 by Christmas, a memorable national controversy may well arise from a dark winter. Mr. Lloyd George realizes this. Millions of electors who do not at present think much about the question will say to themselves, 'We cannot go on like this; if this is the best that free imports can do, it is time to try something else.' A third, at least, of the Labor Party consists of persons who, unlike Mr. Snowden and Mr. Graham, have never had any affinity whatever with orthodox Liberalism.

WHAT will Mr. Lloyd George do? Electoral reform by itself will not help him in the least to keep the Liberal Party together. On the two dominating questions of home politics,—unemployment and agri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culture,—what he has said he has said. At present, Labor and Liberalism under the 'arrangement' gain by supporting each other; but even now more in Parliament than in the country. In the circumstances we have conjectured, they might easily drag each other down. Unless, indeed, they can agree upon a far bolder constructive policy both for town and land. Liberalism must show at the next election that it has attempted something big for agriculture, or it will lose the shires as it has lost the boroughs.

But how can a Labor-Liberal entente do anything big for agriculture, without raising prices, by other means than tariffs? As for unemployment, if it passes the 2,000,000 mark, will Mr. Lloyd George be content to spend at the rate of £80,000,000 a year upon the passive maintenance of increasing idleness without getting anything for it in the shape of work and assets for the nation? Is he to swallow every word he said on that subject in his last campaign? Not at all. He is the last Welshman to eat that length of leek, and it would choke him politically if he tried. Unless we much mistake, two great national constructive policies are going to come into conflict. One of them will propose the open abolition of free imports and the other will mean their disappearance in disguise. Either way, and at long last, industrial Britain, after all her dallying and fumbling since the War, through the ten weakest years in all her modern record, will be saved by 'Necessity—nature's sternest teacher, but the best.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With the Simon Commission's Report on India just out, this message from the greatest poet in the Orient should help to bring East and West together.

Message from INDIA

By RABINDRANATH TAGORE

From the *Manchester Guardian*
Liberal Daily

WHEN I WAS YOUNG we were all full of admiration for Europe with its high civilization and its vast scientific progress, and especially for England, which had brought this civilization to our own doors. We had come to know England through her glorious literature, which had brought a new inspiration into our young lives. The English authors whose books and poems we studied were full of love for humanity, justice, and freedom.

This great literary tradition had come down from the Revolution period. We felt its power in Wordsworth's sonnets about human liberty. We gloried in it even in the immature productions of Shelley.

All this fired our own youthful imaginations. We believed with all our simple faith that even if we rebelled against foreign rule we should have the sympathy of the West. We felt that England was on our side.

But during the interval that followed there came a rude awakening as to our actual relations. We found them at last to be those of force rather than freedom. This not only disturbed in a great measure our youthful dream; it also began to shatter our high idea concerning our English rulers themselves. We came to know at close quarters the Western mentality in its unscrupulous aspect of exploitation, and it revolted us more and more. During the present century, and especially since the European War, this evil seems to have grown still worse, and our bitterness of heart has increased.

Those who live in England, away from the East, have now got to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognize that Europe has completely lost her former moral prestige in Asia. She is no longer regarded as the champion throughout the world of fair dealing and the exponent of high principle, but rather as the upholder of Western race supremacy and the exploiter of those outside her own borders.

For Europe it is, in actual fact, a great moral defeat that has happened. Even though Asia is still physically weak and unable to protect herself from aggression where her vital interests are menaced, nevertheless she can now look down on Europe where before she looked up.

This new strained mental attitude carries with it tragic possibilities of long-continued conflict. The European nations, dimly realizing the danger of this growing alienation, still only think of artificial readjustments through various mechanical means. They merely talk of possibilities of the big powers themselves combining for united action, forgetful of the fact that these very powers are daily destroying world peace, for in their racial pride they altogether ignore the East. They do not realize that their blindness of arrogance and insistence on their own superiority must sooner or later involve both hemispheres in ruin.

IN FACE of all this, which has become more and more apparent to me as I have grown old, I have often been asked in England to offer my opinion about what should be done at the present juncture, when things have become so critical. My answer has always been that I do not believe in any external remedy where inner relations have been so deeply affected. For this reason, I cannot truly point to any short cut to win relief, or any easy remedy to heal the deep-seated disease. What is most needed is a radical change of mind and will and heart.

What I really believe in is a meeting between the best minds of the East and the West in order to come to a frank and honorable understanding. If once such an open channel of communication could be cut, whereby sincere thought might flow freely between us, unobstructed by mutual jealousy and suspicion and unimpeded by self-interest and racial pride, then a reconciliation might be effected.

Meanwhile let it be clearly understood in the West that we who are born in the East still acknowledge in our heart of hearts the greatness of the European civilization. Even when in our weakness and humiliation we aggressively try to deny this we still inwardly accept it. The younger generation of the East, in spite of its bitterness of soul, is eager to learn from the West, and to assimilate the best that Europe has to offer. Even in our futile attempts to sever our connection with the West, while we struggle for political freedom, we are really paying the West the highest compliment we can offer. For we acknowledge in the very act of striving for liberty the noble character of the Western edu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cation which has roused us from our slumbers. We tacitly admit that it was the literature of the West which inspired us with a courageous love of freedom and aroused us to proclaim our independence.

The comparative immunity which we enjoyed in the past, together with large powers of freedom of speech—all this quickened our courage and kept us free within. It should therefore be the anxious care as well as the proud privilege of Britain to maintain and foster the encouragement of that freedom. In spite of the trouble in which we are all involved at the present moment, England has to show herself broad-minded, upright, and conciliatory in her dealings with India to-day.

For it must be clearly understood in England that complications have now arisen which can never be done away with by repression and by violent display of physical power. They can only be cured by some real greatness of heart which will attract in its turn a genuine spirit of coöperation from our side. Those who have experience of bureaucratic and irresponsible governments can easily understand how the repressive measures which are being undertaken to-day, culminating in martial law at Sholapur, are bound to react upon our own people, for fear and panic always make a government in power harsh and vindictive. Instances of this are well known in human history, and what is happening to-day in India is not likely to be an exception.

Though much news has been suppressed, still information keeps trickling through from those who are reaching England by sea from India. They tell us how cruel and arbitrary is the punishment that is being meted out even to those who have been entirely inoffensive. These actions are called by high-sounding names, such as 'upholding law and order,' when they are themselves the worst breaches of the law of humanity, which is greater than any other.

As a slight indication of the contemptuous violence which is being exercised under the cover of martial law we are told by press cables from India how the military go about the streets of Sholapur with sticks, flicking off the white caps of those who wear such a headdress in honor of Mahatma Gandhi. The physical suffering may be slight, but the insult will be deeply resented by millions who hold Mahatma Gandhi's name in reverence. If such insolent actions continue these proud people will have to pay the penalty later, for the mute cry of the defenseless and weak cannot be ignored.

The time will come when reparation will have to be made. Therefore I trust and hope that the best minds of England will feel ashamed of every form of tyrannical action, just as we ourselves have been ashamed at the violence which has broken out on our side. We must on no account, if we can help it, find ourselves involved in a vicious circle wherein one violence leads on to another, for that in the end can only result in further bitterness and estrangement.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thanks to the Young Plan, Europe has adequate financial machinery for working out her salvation. Will her statesmen and politicians rise to the occasion?

EUROPE'S Next Phase

By HANS ZEHRER

Translated from the *Vossische Zeitung*
Berlin Liberal Daily

WHEN THE DAWES PLAN was signed and put into effect it was succeeded by a series of European negotiations which culminated in the Locarno Pact. Politics followed finance. Statesmen who had occupied inferior positions while the bankers and financiers were deliberating awoke to new life, forcing themselves again into the foreground, mounting the speakers' tribunes and deluging the world with waterfalls of words. One might have thought that such things as finance and economics had never existed. Allowing for a few changes in style, a little less gold on their collars and a little less braid on their sleeves, these statesmen looked like the diplomats of former times—Richelieu, Talleyrand, and Metternich. During 1924 and 1925 passionate oratory rang out from the speakers' platforms. At Geneva politics experienced its first great renaissance, and all Europe applauded MacDonald, Briand, and Stresemann.

But of course all this was only possible because the silent men in gray business suits had already performed their task. When the financiers and economists had finished conferring behind closed doors and had come to decisions whose romance the general public does not yet understand, the statesmen arose and began investing the dull, everyday realities with the glamour of their speeches.

All this occurred after the Dawes Plan had been signed and it was a state of affairs that lasted through 1924 and 1925. The Locarno Pact was the chief accomplishment of this period, which came to an end at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thoiry in 1926 when the dynamic forces that had animated this particular political development exhausted themselves. We find ourselves to-day in a similar position. Again finance and economics have said their say and completed their conferences. The Young Plan has replaced the Dawes Plan. The second Hague Conference has come to a definite conclusion. A series of smaller technical conferences has been completed and definite results have been attained. On the fifteenth of May the Young Plan went into effect, and, on the 25th, shares in the Bank of International Settlements were being offered for sale. Once again the path is open for statesmen and politicians. Finance and economics have withdrawn from the scene and politics again occupies the stage. The period of figures and statistics has come to an end and the era of political conferences and speeches begins.

WHAT stage of development has the present period reached? We must first make a brief comparison with the Dawes era. The first negotiations for the Dawes Plan commenced in October, 1923, and an agreement was finally signed in London in August, 1924. At the League session in Geneva that September, MacDonald, Herriot, and Briand made their great speeches which later led to the refusal of the British Conservative government to sign the Geneva protocol. In October, 1925, the Locarno Conference occurred and the treaty arrived at on that occasion was signed in London that December. On the 8th of September, 1926, Germany entered the League of Nations and on the 17th of September Stresemann and Briand met at Thoiry. The interlocking forces that animated the Dawes and Locarno epoch therefore lasted about three years.

The present era opened with the September, 1928, session of the League at Geneva. In February, 1929, the Young Plan experts met in Paris and on the 7th of June they came to an agreement. In August the first Hague Conference and in January the second Hague Conference reached decisive conclusions. At the same time the London Naval Conference commenced, bringing world politics into the foreground and extending the effects of the recent financial conferences into the political sphere and outside the boundaries of Europe. The London Conference has now come to an end and again the statesmen are preparing great political speeches for the next League session at Geneva. We therefore find ourselves at a period corresponding to September, 1924, in the Dawes era, some two weeks after the conclusion of the Dawes Conference and a few days before the September session of the League, when MacDonald and Herriot made their great speeches. Let us remember, therefore, that when the first year of the Dawes era had come to an end two years of political negotiations began.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The preparations for the coming League session indicate that a period of the bitterest struggle over the stabilization of Europe has begun. For the first time in a long while we are again discussing European affairs and suddenly recognizing how long it has been since we have talked in this way. The last great outburst of European enthusiasm occurred at the Locarno Conference, whose spirit we honored for a few years until it gradually died out in fresh financial negotiations. By comparing our present situation with our position at that time we can readily see how the European situation has changed. At Locarno Germany with the aid of the English broke the hitherto united front of the victorious powers and gained recognition as a political equal, while France for a long time stood out distrustfully against this movement. To-day, however, France is attempting to bring about the financial stabilization of Europe and arrange the newly awakened tendencies and forces in a strong system, while other countries distrustfully oppose these efforts.

French politics have taken the initiative because France has recognized that the Versailles Treaty has gradually broken down. The French have gone as far as they can with land and sea armaments, with fortifications and military alliances, but the pyramid of power they have tried to erect is blunt. It has no point. France has never obtained that decisive factor which she needs for her security and which all her guarantees and treaties have failed to win for her: a firm alliance with England and America. Her demands for such an alliance met with direct refusal at the London Conference and as a result of that conference Europe is facing a fundamental change. Spiritual and moral ideas are altering. New generations have appeared whose members are more interested in the future than in the past. Our conception of the state is undergoing a profound modification. Economics dominate everything. All Europe, indeed, all the world is moving in this direction. A chaotic struggle prevails and in the midst of all these fresh dynamic forces one country alone insists on remaining as it is, spiritually, politically, and economically. One country only wants to keep things as they are—France.

IF ONE looks at French policy from a purely political point of view, France's desire to stabilize Europe very naturally conceals her thoughts of power and striving for security. As a victorious power on the verge of a period of decline, she wants to remain forever at the high point to which her victory in the War brought her. But if one looks at France from aspects other than the political and takes into consideration all of French intellectual life one at once recognizes what dominates the country. In all other countries changes are occurring and realism prevails. Only France remains exempt. She is out of balance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The great problems of other nations hardly affect France at all and her inhabitants, with their peasant and bourgeois mentality, desire no change. France wants to live undisturbed now that her position has been built up and secured.

But with all these changes in other countries there is a growing danger that France will miss connections and find herself isolated in a world that has taken another path. Changing conditions are undermining French ascendancy and if it does not collapse entirely it will crumble away bit by bit. For that reason France is endeavoring to stabilize Europe and to mould the new forces and tendencies in such a way that they will be able to consolidate her ascendancy. These are the reasons why Briand has begun his European battle and attempted to attract the whole continent to his leadership. The hopes of joint guarantees for which French policy has struggled from the time of the Versailles Treaty to the London Conference have dwindled. America cannot be expected to enter any binding agreement or England either, so that French policy must do what it can with Europe independently.

The defeated powers and their desire for a revision of treaties are not entering into the case this time. Germany is for the present virtually ignored. The Saar negotiations move back and forth between Berlin and Paris but they hardly command the full attention of the French. Developments in Southeastern Europe centring about Vienna, Budapest, and Sofia are also comparatively unimportant. Yet these matters, too, could be quite easily adjusted if one danger were not always threatening Paris in the background: Italy.

Here lies the fundamental change that has occurred since the Dawes-Locarno epoch ended. At that time Germany stood alone facing a united front of victorious powers. To-day Germany is standing more or less to one side but the united front of victorious powers is broken. Anglo-French relations have cooled off and the centre of the European scene is dominated by Italy, which has become the foremost advocate of a revision of European frontiers and now stands as the chief enemy of France. French diplomacy in Europe will therefore be determined by the outcome of the Franco-Italian negotiations. If a definite agreement can be reached between Rome and Paris that satisfies Fascist demands, a stabilization of Europe favorable to France will occur. Any demands that may be made by Germany, Austria, Hungary, or Bulgaria will then be decided by a strong Continental court of appeal and the present dispute between Rome and Paris in the Balkans and the Mediterranean, which has stirred up so many foreign passions, will be ended. But if a Franco-Italian agreement is not reached all the hopes of a stabilized Europe or of Pan-Europa are illusions, for the present at least, because the Fascist desire for treaty revision will give all other states demanding revision fresh enthusiasm and strength.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Has British Socialism failed? A reactionary French journalist says it has; a Laborite London editor replies that the bloodless revolution has only begun.

How about Socialism?

A Franco-British Debate

I. Socialists in the Saddle

By Henri de Kerillis
Translated from the *Echo de Paris*, Paris Clerical Daily

I WENT TO LONDON to plunge myself for a few days in the atmosphere of the Labor Party, hoping to find useful suggestions for ourselves and not intending to occupy myself with Indians, Egyptians, Arabs, and Jews. As luck would have it, however, my arrival just coincided with the rupture of the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations. I had prophesied an unhappy outcome of the conference last fall when I was visiting Cairo, and the Labor bluff, as I have always called it, ended as all election bluffs end, in a lamentable deflation. On this point, as on many others, I saw for myself how the great hopes aroused by English Socialism have given place to bitter disillusionment.

I had not spent an hour in the imperial capital before luck again favored me and I unexpectedly met the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. The last time I had encountered this descendant of the Prophet was six months ago in the outer sanctuary of the mosque of Omar. I now found him clothed in his black robes and wearing a white turban, comfortably installed on the divan of the smoking room of the Hyde Park Hotel. Naturally his presence aroused my curiosity. I knew that he was a member of the Arab delegation that had very politely come to beg the MacDonald Government to abolish the Jewish state in Palestine. But though I was at first tempted to extract information from this Oriental diplomat, his first words dissipated my hopes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Will you,' he said, 'permit me to offer you a cup of coffee?'

'I am very honored, your Excellency, but thank you, no. It is six o'clock in the afternoon and I prefer to remember only the coffee that I took from the exquisite little cup you offered me in Jerusalem.'

The Grand Mufti smiled in a way that led me to suppose he had only uttered a formal invitation and that he really felt nothing but disdain for that black brew that the Occidental inhabitants of England have baptized coffee.

I could not, however, help adding, 'I am amazed, your Excellency, to hear you speak French. Evidently you must have learned the language since you left the Orient, for you told me then that you did not know a word of it and now you speak it remarkably.'

'Oh,' he replied, caressing his blond beard, 'I spoke it quite well when you were there, but those were difficult times and it was really to the interests of a diplomat to use an interpreter.'

I confess I laughed aloud, but I did not feel like pushing the conversation along political lines with such a prudent personage. Instead, I turned to the English themselves for information about the mission of this enigmatical mufti, who had been accused by the British Commission at Jerusalem of having incited the Mohammedans to assassinate the Jews. I was told, for instance, that when judgment was leveled against him he replied with singular audacity to the British High Commissioner, 'Your Excellency, you will perhaps permit me to recall that we are now but a few paces from Pilate's pretorium. If the Roman was unable to prevent fanatical Jews from killing Christ, how could I have prevented a few hot-heads from killing Jews?'

HERE, then, is what I discovered about the mission of the Arab delegation. They have big appetites, these gentlemen, for they demanded (1) that no Jew shall be allowed to enter Palestine territory; (2) that no Jew shall be authorized to buy Arab land; (3) and that there shall be no more talk of a Jewish national home or of a Jewish state, and that a Palestine state governed by a parliament be established in which the overwhelming Mohammedan majority shall lay down the law to the Jews.

These three categorical demands involve the downright abolition of Zionism and the annulment of the promises Lord Balfour made to the Jews. The embarrassment of the Labor ministers can easily be imagined. On the one hand, the British Jews represent a redoubtable force in the world—and they are the only Jews in western Europe who believe in Zionism, for the simple reason that Zionism can only exist within the British Empire and to the profit of that Empire. They have money, quantities of money. I was even told that they had tried

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to dazzle the Arab delegation by offering them monumental sums for the Wailing Wall with a view to building a synagogue above it. But, above all else, the Jews in England wield great power in all the political parties. They hold some of the purse strings of every one of them and they occupy seats in Parliament, too. Not without reason do these Jews announce, 'If you give way to the Arabs and eliminate Zionism, which happens to attract their attention just now, they will soon turn against you.'

The Arabs, on the other hand, hold the trump card at the moment and tell the British, 'You will only triumph in India if you have the Mohammedans with you and you will not have their support if you continue to insult them in their holy places.' And these threats hold true because close contact has been established between the Arabs in Jerusalem and the Mohammedans in Calcutta and Bombay.

What will happen? I have heard the most diverse and contradictory opinions expressed and I myself am inclined to believe that the Foreign Office is prepared to render a judgment worthy of Solomon. It cannot shut the doors of Palestine under the Jews' very noses but it contemplates excluding them for four or five years, which would be a terrible blow to Zionism. It does not wish to issue a categorical decree stopping the purchase of land for the Jewish national home, but it plans to take measures that will achieve the same purpose, which would also be a terrible blow to Zionism. On the other hand, England does not want to hear any talk of a parliament in a free Palestine. She knows that the Jews and the Christians, too, would form a tiny minority that would lie at the mercy of the Mohammedans. She is therefore confining her efforts to a mixed constitution and is proposing that the Jewish national home shall subsist within the body of the Palestine state with a consultative consul. But the mere prospect of such a thing has brought forth heart-rending lamentations from the Jews, while the Christians grumble and the Mohammedans threaten.

Zionism is an adventure in the course of which the Jewish leaders, carried away by mystical enthusiasm, have not only lost all idea of their difficulties but even of the most elementary realities. The situation in Palestine to-day seems inextricable and more threatening than ever. Yet England faces these conditions advantageously in spite of the fact that she is obliged to throw some ballast overboard, for the insoluble dramatic quarrel between the Jews and the Arabs fits in perfectly with Britain's time-honored colonial policy of setting hostile religions and races against each other in order to justify her presence.

AS FOR the British Socialists, they are gentlemen with excellent manners and I was greatly pleased to be invited to dine with some of them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the House of Commons. Seated at our table were Mr. Henderson, the son of the Foreign Minister and himself a member of Parliament; Dr. Shiels, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies; Mr. Horrabin, a member for Peterborough and a representative of the extreme left wing; and Ellen Wilkinson, a charming female M.P.

I took care not to open discussions of a political nature. The place did not seem propitious for an exchange of profound views and intimate confidences. It was not therefore from my hosts that I sought for certain information about English Socialism. I addressed myself instead to a distinguished professor who enjoys great authority in the Labor Party and whose considered views seem to me to represent the average opinion of the party. Here are some of his subtle analyses that throw a great light on Laborite theories.

'Are you,' I asked, 'in favor of abolishing private property?'

'Not at all. You will not find a single influential English Marxian Socialist who agrees with your Socialists in this respect. We consider the socialization of property to be absolutely chimerical.'

'However, you want to nationalize the banks, the mines, the insurance companies, and the railroads?'

'Yes, that is the distinct aim we have in view. We are advancing very slowly in this direction but we are advancing.'

'Then you will resort to confiscation?'

'We are considering confiscation, but not robbery. We concede that when the state takes over individual or collective property it should indemnify the former owners.'

'Does what you say apply to land?'

'Yes, when the time comes we shall take land that has been monopolized for centuries by a few large families. Of course, we shall compensate the proprietors. We shall not split up the domains among the peasants, which is a mistaken policy quite opposed to true progress. Instead, we shall organize such properties into vast coöperatives of production.'

'Do you imagine that such measures can be taken without upheavals?'

'Yes, on condition that we move very slowly and avoid agitation. We are evolutionists. We do not admit that any good can come of violent revolutions.'

'When you embark on your transformations you are going to frighten the capitalists. Aren't you afraid that money will be hoarded or exported and that the national economy will be profoundly disturbed?'

'That is a delicate point, we admit. But I repeat that everything will be done gradually. We shall imprison the money little by little. And where would the surplus go, in any event? America is saturated, and continental Europe is heading toward a form of Socialism much more dangerous than ours.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'You have been in power for a year and yet you have not been able to put through one of your measures.'

'True. Circumstances do not permit.'

'Do your supporters at the polls reproach you?'

'A little, but we explain things. It is a matter of propaganda.'

'Meanwhile are you going to take fiscal measures against wealth?'

'Yes.'

'Only money enables audacious industrial experiments to be undertaken and only money can pay for scientific research. Can you conceive of a great civilization in a country where there are no great fortunes? There are no precedents in history.'

'A well organized state must replace individuals and create the conditions of civilization which you mention. It is true that history offers no precedent but we shall see what experience reveals. We shall stop when we have to.'

SO spoke the doctrinaire Socialist and his words give us grounds for passing judgment. Unquestionably, English Socialism has less virulence than ours. It is infinitely more moderate, more prudent. It has already tasted power, met difficulties, and measured the risks it may run. It fears catastrophe more than it dares to admit. It is above all else sentimental. In other words, it pays relatively little attention to theories and doctrines but devotes itself, as someone told me, to examining policies with a view to determining where the interests of the working class lie. It is essentially opportunist, like other British parties, all of which, unlike our parties in France, are averse to sweeping programmes that can never be realized. It acts, evolves, and advances by dealing only with difficulties of the moment. The word 'possibilistic' best describes its attitude. It would, however, be childish to deny that its veins contain dangerous elements, traces of the same mortal poison that is weakening all contemporary Socialism. If it is the enemy of private property, it is also the enemy of wealth. Unlike the audacious neo-capitalism of America, it tends to level down pitilessly the privileged classes to the same level as the unprivileged classes, entirely losing sight of the fact that the true ideal is elevation of the poor man into the rich man. It takes short, simple, mediocre, and primitive attitudes.

If it could move freely and obey its own desires it would soon be able to lead England to decadence and ruin, but it is not alone and, in power even more than in opposition, it undergoes continual pressure from the great forces to which it has been able in its turn to communicate its conceptions of true social generosity. Its future will depend on the extent to which it will be influenced, dominated, and modified by its Conservative adversary.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rarely has any government met with more misfortunes than the present Labor Cabinet in England. For the first time Socialism has held power over a long period in a great modern country, and what a spectacle it presents! The failure of the London Conference in its most essential aspects. Bloody uprisings in India. In Egypt rash offers to the Egyptian Nationalists, negotiations, definite rupture. In Palestine serious trouble, inability to reach any agreement between Jews and Arabs, an inextricable situation.

No doubt it will be said that some of these colonial difficulties originated long ago and that responsibility can be traced back to previous Conservative governments. But we must not lose sight of the fact that measures which a government of authority can take without risk immediately become dangerous when undertaken by a reputedly feeble government. Furthermore, the Labor Party had aroused undue hopes in the imperial colonies. The nebulous idealism that inspires it, its ill-defined internationalism, the horror with which it views warfare have encouraged sedition. English common sense is not deceived and can clearly distinguish at the present crisis how large a part fate has played and how much larger a part the present ministers of the country have played.

More failures. First of all a budget with a deficit. Instead of an excess of four million pounds sterling of receipts over expenditures such as occurred during the previous year, 1929–1930 closed with a deficit of more than fourteen and a half million pounds sterling. The Labor Government has vainly attempted to place responsibility on former Chancellor of the Exchequer Churchill, who was well able to defend himself. Mr. Snowden has held power for eleven of the twelve months of the past year.

It has therefore been necessary to vote new taxes in order to avoid falling back on a loan. The Laborites have raised the income tax and the surplus tax, increased the death duties, and even taxed the manufacture of beer in such a way that the consumer will sooner or later be affected in spite of all official declarations to the contrary.

Clearly the Socialist administration has not been brilliant financially, yet in relation to unemployment its activities have been even more deplorable, in spite of all the fine promises made during the general election of 1929. At that time Messrs. MacDonald, Thomas & Company offered guaranteed remedies to the voters. They had in their pockets grand projects for public works for the unemployed. They had plans for a better division of labor. They believed that they would be able to organize new currents of emigration. But, alas, nothing has succeeded. Unemployment has grown rather than diminished. There are about two hundred thousand more workers sitting with folded arms in front of their sad little black houses. Two hundred thousand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more idle, hungry, perplexed workers—that is the record of the workers' government.

What will happen? Will the malcontent and disillusioned element move further and further to the left as they would in France, or will they return to the Conservative Party? That question interested me more than any other and I tried to inform myself on it in political circles. I therefore asked this question: 'Formerly the swing from Liberal to Conservative was entirely logical, since both parties represented the same political order. Now, however, Conservatives and Socialists hold opposite conceptions. How can a worker opposed to the capitalist régime become a Conservative merely because the Labor Party has disappointed him? Why will he not move to a more extreme and revolutionary political group?' This was the reply I received: 'You reason as if the workers were doctrinaire. They are not. And you forget the great attractions of the Conservative Party.'

The great attractions of the Conservative Party, there is the explanation. When a British Socialist becomes doubtful, discouraged, disheartened in regard to his party's activity, Conservative propaganda is always at hand waiting to attract him. In France, on the other hand, a disillusioned Socialist would become a Communist just as a disgusted Radical becomes a Socialist or a disgusted Progressive becomes a Radical. We keep sliding to the left because there is nothing to the right, because there is no force that appeals and inspires, because there is no great party continually turning out propaganda to influence public opinion. If my readers will reflect on this point they will understand what we French Conservatives want to do with our feeble forces, what we have been trying to realize for the past four years in the midst of great difficulties. Our desires and hopes will at once become clear and will perhaps be shared, since the same element that is ready to save our neighboring country from the worst kind of disaster can also save our own.

II. The Limits of Socialism

By a Labor Editor
From the *New Statesman*, London Independent Weekly

A GOOD DEAL has been written, especially since Mr. Snowden's budget speech, in support of the view that this country has now reached the limits of what is sometimes called 'insular Socialism.' In other words, it is being urged that neither Great Britain nor any other country acting in isolation can afford to take any drastic steps toward the redistribution of wealth on a more equal and equitable basis, because the country which attempts to do this without the collaboration

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of its neighbors will inevitably hamper itself in the struggle for world markets, and dry up the very sources of the wealth which it is seeking to redistribute. Obviously, if this view is even half right, it must have very important morals, of which a Labor Government above all others is under an obligation to take notice; and it is accordingly being pressed upon Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues with all the force and eloquence its upholders can command.

But is it true, or even half true? That there is in it something of substance no one is likely to deny. If, for example, the Government were to attempt the enforcement of minimum rates of wages considerably above the actual rates now being paid in our export trades, it is obvious that British manufacturers would be handicapped in competition with those of other countries, and that the immediate result would be an increase in the numbers of the unemployed. The same thing would happen if the Government were to impose additional taxes falling directly on the cost of production, and were to use the proceeds for an increase in the social services. These measures might have the laudable object of placing more purchasing power in the hands of the workers, and thus stimulating home demand; but no responsible person supposes that, if they were put into force alone, they would really have this effect. The higher wages would be counteracted by decreased employment; and the expanded social services, if they did not produce the same effect, would probably lead to a vigorous attempt by employers to keep down their costs by reducing wages.

It is, then, in the first place true enough that this country cannot afford to pursue a wage policy that takes no account of the levels of production costs in other parts of the world. And it is also true that, if we desire to expand our social services without setting up undesirable reactions on wages or employment, we must find means of doing so without levying additional taxes in such a way as to add to the costs of production. It may be granted, in addition, that this is not at all an easy thing to do; for, though taxes on incomes do not fall directly on costs, no one denies that they may to some extent react indirectly so as to affect them.

IS, THEN, the case against 'insular Socialism' made out? If it is, we are in a bad way indeed, for more than one reason. For any rapid approach to more equal distribution of incomes by common consent of the leading industrial nations seems to involve even more difficulties than, say, naval disarmament or the abandonment of high tariffs by international agreement; and we have cause to know that neither of these is an easy thing to secure. Moreover, it is quite certain that the political pressure in this country toward more equal distribution will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grow stronger rather than weaker, and that, whatever Government may be in office, we shall continue to pay out more money in pensions, allowances, and services of various sorts, and to raise the means of doing this by taxation. Even if it could be shown that this course is economically unsound, the demonstration of its unsoundness would no more stop politicians from doing it than Mr. Norman Angell was able to stop the European War by proving conclusively that it would not pay.

Great Britain is not, however, in our view yet in the unfortunate situation which the critics of 'insular Socialism' suppose her to have reached. She can, we believe, advance considerably further along the road of redistribution without the evil economic consequences that are feared, provided that our statesmen set about their task in the right way. We are not suggesting that this right way is to go on adding indefinitely to the general burden of direct taxation, on the doctrinaire ground that the income tax does not affect costs. Direct taxation has, indeed, very great advantages over indirect; and where we must increase tax burdens we had certainly better do so by taxing incomes than, say, commodities. But the point that it is essential for us to bear in mind is that the rate and the yield of a tax are two very different things. Our taxes today have to be high in rate because their yield is low; and their yield is low because we are making quite inadequate use of the industrial resources that are at our command. The vital need is to increase the yield of taxes; and the possibility of a large expansion in the social services depends far more on a better yield of taxation than on a higher rate.

But how are we to do this? The yield of our taxes is low precisely because many of our workers are not working, many of our productive resources unused or used far below their full capacity, and some trades at any rate working at cut prices that leave many firms little or no margin of profit. Especially in the export trades, we seem able to increase our output only if we cut our price; and, especially in the home market, we seem able to increase profits only if we restrict production. Both these facts point clearly to the same cause. Our costs of production are too high, in relation to the general level of world costs.

Now, for many of our manufacturers, the obvious conclusion to be drawn from this situation is that our wages are too high, and that, if wages could be reduced, demand would improve and profits recover in all trades the satisfactory level which they have maintained only in certain lines of business during recent years. But this is a wholly unwarrantable view. If we reduced the level of our wages, it is clear that we could do this only at the cost of lowering the working-class standard of living; for we should not be able to buy more cheaply the things which we import, and these make up a large part of the budget of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working-class household. Nor would reduced wages cause a corresponding fall in the prices even of home-produced commodities; for these depend largely on imported materials. But a reduction in the standard of life for the workers is precisely what we set out to avoid; for the object under discussion is that of raising working-class buying power by a more even distribution of incomes. Moreover, a fall in wages would evidently react on demand in the trades producing for home consumption, and thus tend to offset any expansion in exports by a diminution of sales at home.

WHAT then are we to do? The true conclusion of the whole argument is that we must, at all costs, improve our efficiency as producers. We must produce more cheaply, not by the illusory method of paying less wages for the same production, but by increasing the productivity of industry. It is sometimes suggested that even if we were to do this it would be of no avail, because the capacity of the market is limited, and even at lower prices no greatly increased quantity of commodities could be sold. This view is at the bottom of the opposition to 'rationalization' on the ground that it is certain to increase unemployment. But, even if rationalization is likely for the time to add to the numbers of the unemployed, it is certainly not true that the demand for all things is inelastic. It is true that, if we can really produce goods more cheaply, we shall be able to sell more of them both at home and abroad.

It is, however, essential to realize that, in the home market, the result cannot be achieved if wages are reduced. High wages are essential to high production; and low wages and low production go together. We do not interpret Mr. Snowden's declaration against a further increase of taxes next year as involving a check to the process of redistributing wealth. We understand it rather as an indication that the means of pursuing this policy must be sought chiefly in improving the efficiency of industry. And, if this interpretation is correct, it implies, on the part of the Government, not a surrender to Liberalism or a relaxation of effort, but rather an intensified campaign with the object of speeding up the necessary work of industrial reorganization.

The policy of Socialism, as we understand it, is very far from being summed up in a mere extension of the scope of the social services. Most Socialists doubtless desire to see these services greatly extended; but that is a desire which they share with many who are not Socialists at all—with Miss Rathbone, for example, and with many Liberals and with reformers of all sorts. The Socialist, however, is of all these people least likely to be dismayed if economists try to prove to him that these things cannot be done 'under capitalism.' Such a demon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stration, so far from causing him to relax his efforts, will only make him more eager to end, or at least to amend, a system which, on the admission of its own defenders, leads to such untoward results. If private enterprise cannot admit better distribution, he will say, the private enterprise must go, or at least be modified by the infusion of a different system.

In taking this stand, surely the Socialist is largely in the right. The inability of our present economic system to stand a more even distribution of wealth is demonstrably due to its own shortcomings. It does not produce enough 'surplus' to provide the means for a satisfactory distribution. It is not efficient enough: it does not produce enough for each unit of effort that it uses up; and for this reason it leaves a great deal of potential effort unused. It has had, during the past dozen years, ample opportunities of putting its house in order; and it has not used them—often, indeed, it has lamentably abused them. Has not the time come to try another method?

WE ARE not, of course, suggesting that the time is ripe for any dramatic plunge into the seas of state Socialism. That is, for the present, outside the realm of practical politics. But, that the time has come for the state to apply considerably more pressure in order to bring about the reorganization of industry, we think the financial situation of the country does plainly show. Brains and capital must be applied to bring our industries up to modern standards. Employers must be got to act as units in a coördinated scheme instead of playing a lone hand. Restrictive trade-union rules, where they exist, must be modified equally with other restrictive or obsolete business practices. In short, so far from having reached the limits of 'insular Socialism,' this country is really at a point where a substantial dose of constructive Socialism is its greatest economic need.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Did France come out at the short end of the horn at the recent Naval Conference? An influential Paris journalist draws some rather unflattering comparisons between London and Washington.

From Washington *to* London

By JACQUES BARDOUX

Translated from *Le Temps*
Paris Semi-Official Daily

THE NEGOTIATORS of the naval treaty that was signed on April 22nd celebrated the importance of their labors in the usual fashion. 'I believe that under the circumstances it would be futile for anyone to represent this conference as a failure. It is one more formidable advance on the road of disarmament,' announced Mr. Alexander, the Labor M.P. who is now First Lord of the Admiralty. He also used the words 'decisive progress' and Foreign Minister Henderson confirmed him by speaking of a 'new departure, since the technical obstacles that barred the way of the preparatory commission have been overcome.'

James Ramsay MacDonald, in his radio address delivered on the twenty-second of April, expressed the same enthusiasm and spoke of the London Naval Conference as being a great step forward toward permanent peace. In short, the Socialists evinced a singular appetite for diplomatic laurels, whose value they appreciate at election time. They recognize the present prestige they enjoy. Diplomatic successes, even more than enormous doles, help them to make the good people forget that elected Socialists ought to have stamped out poverty and abolished unemployment. Promises of yesterday—snows of yesteryear! For in all essential respects they have only been able to pursue the work that the Conservative Party had already undertaken. The realization of their chimeric Socialist dreams has had to be postponed.

But electoral necessities cannot prevail over historic truth. From the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long battle for naval disarmament, which psychological disagreement over guarantees has reduced to an effort toward maritime equilibrium on the part of the non-European powers, the London Conference undoubtedly emerges as a much less important event than the Washington Conference. It is entirely inaccurate for Ramsay MacDonald to declare at the last session that, 'in comparison with Washington, we have progressed a long way.'

London brought forth a single treaty of twenty-six articles in five sections, one section signed by three powers and four signed by five powers, these sections being of unequal length and of unequal importance. Washington brought forth a huge volume including eight treaties of a naval character and six of a political character, nine resolutions, eight of which applied to China, and six declarations all relating to the Far East.

After many hesitations London attained a purely technical objective and the three non-European navies will merely complete under certain conditions the reductions begun in 1922. As for the five naval powers represented at Washington, certain details have been agreed upon in relation to replacing battleships, limiting the tonnage of aëroplane carriers, and putting reasonable limits on submarine construction. London continues in part a work already begun but offers no innovations.

AT WASHINGTON, after full deliberation in advance, an essentially political objective was achieved. When the American government invited the other powers to participate in a conference for the limitation of armaments it took good care to state that the questions of the Pacific and the Far East would also be discussed. On February 9th, 1922, the American delegation told the American president that it had fulfilled its mandate, and made it clear that disarmament and security could not be dissociated. 'Rivalry in armaments arises from a state of mind in which a nation, because it foresees the attack of some other country, decides upon what preparations to make. Before stopping this rivalry it is first necessary to consider the state of mind from which it arises.' In other words it was impossible to reduce armaments in the Pacific without increasing security in the Pacific. If the direction taken at Washington had been maintained and the methods employed there pursued still further the debate on disarmament would have reached the only logical and effective conclusion it could have attained. In order to extend the limitation clauses of the three-power agreement to Europe the London Conference should have first of all attacked and solved the problem of European security. The ground was prepared, but too many solutions were offered. The Conference got off to a bad start and solved nothing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Washington Conference, on the other hand, faced an infinitely more complicated and less explored situation. Instead of a Europe that had returned to the habits of peace, it was dealing with an inorganic, unorganized Asia, with the fermentation of the Chinese and the gangrene of Russia, with hostile appetites and rivalries. Peace had to be established, maps redrawn, an alliance dissolved, and, above all, a hegemony broken. At the beginning of 1921 Japan virtually controlled the Chinese coast. From Formosa and the Pescadores it watched over the Yangtze and Canton. Korea and Port Arthur assured it access to northern China. The occupation of Sakhalin opened up to Japan the Amur basin. It occupied nearly all the ports. It controlled the customs and wireless services. The steamship companies and railways that had brought about this occupation were in most cases subsidized and in all cases controlled by the government at Tokyo. But Japan was not satisfied with holding ports and railways, for such means of transportation would only be useful if they could enable the overindustrialized mother country to procure a sure supply of raw materials.

Supported by this armature of steel and coal and guaranteed by its alliance with England, Japan enjoyed predominance in the Far East and seemed to present an insurmountable obstacle to the reëstablishment of equilibrium in that quarter and to the limitation of naval forces. This obstacle the Naval Conference at Washington was only able to overcome because it gave the Empire of the Rising Sun the assurance of greater security. First of all it offered moral security. The four-power Pacific agreement signed on the thirteenth of December, 1921, placed Japan on an equal footing with the European powers in the Pacific, introducing it into the aristocratic circle of colonial empires and guaranteeing it against isolation or encirclement. The Washington Conference also gave Japan political security. To be sure, the treaty only deals with the relative rights of the insular possessions and insular dominions, and the list of them is limited. Unquestionably, too, the treaty does not involve the use of sanctions, it does not even imply the obligation not to resort to arms. It simply provides for the calling of a conference in case of some difference arising between any of the signatory powers in regard to some question in the Pacific.

Finally, Japan is assured of military security in three respects. The United States and the United Kingdom engage not to fortify their island possessions in the Pacific, including Hong Kong and the Philippines, but excluding Hawaii and Australasia. This provision not only guarantees the Empire of the Rising Sun against any armed aggression, it also assures its uninterrupted exchange of goods with China and assures its supply of raw materials from that quarter. It likewise enables Japan, in case of war, to occupy Hong Kong and the Philippines and thus to acquire money and two operating bases.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Confirmed in its ownership of the island of Yap, the pivot of the Pacific cable system, maintained in sure possession of those mines and railways on which it already held mortgages, Japan was willing to abandon other possessions, to approve the new status of China and to reduce her naval forces. In short, the Empire of the Rising Sun obtained the same security that the London Conference would have granted to France if it had neutralized the waters and disarmed the islands of the western Mediterranean. Thus France would have enjoyed an open road. Her contacts with Africa would have been permanently secured and she could have gone on receiving raw materials from that quarter. Furthermore, her own armed forces could have been cut down.

BUT solutions that hold good in the Pacific do not apply to the Mediterranean. Truth outside Europe, error within Europe. Security is legitimate when Japan asks for it in exchange for certain boats or when Britain achieves it automatically by the two-power standard, but it is looked upon as an excess of logical zeal and a survival of foolish vanity when France demands it as a preliminary condition to French disarmament.

The Washington Conference will leave a painful mark on French history. The meek acceptance of an absolutely unjust naval ratio represents a failure for which the signature of the four-power agreement in the Pacific offers no adequate compensation. Eight years later at London a very different greeting was accorded to our delegates and an almost cordial atmosphere prevailed. Except for one or two minor incidents, no press campaign of falsehood was launched against France, as happened in Washington. The diplomatic correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* was almost the only man to criticize unmercifully all the French claims and to refute pitilessly every French thesis. No one attempted to discuss, or far less to justify, the low naval coefficient that our representatives at the Washington Conference of 1921–22 had been so weak as to accept.

Our demands for tonnage were on the whole considered valid. Our methods for limitation were partially approved. The hypocritical, biased attack on our submarine building that was launched at Washington did not recur. Our definition of submarine warfare and our provision for the size of submarine units were accepted. The right to subordinate tonnage reduction to guarantees for security was accorded recognition.

This change of attitude and this purged atmosphere were not only due to the fact that we had prepared our case more carefully and had evolved happier tactics; they also confirmed the financial revival for which M. Raymond Poincaré is responsible. They are the result of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

activity of M. Georges Leygues as Minister of Marine, and, finally, they are the fruit of M. Aristide Briand's diplomatic abilities and of M. Tardieu's personal prestige. In short, ten years of French labor have borne their just fruits. By virtue of her moral authority and material force France can now say no emphatically each time her rights are threatened without arousing anyone's indignation or alarm. That is the real success and useful lesson of the London Conference.

Africa is fast replacing the Far East as a centre of European exploitation. A German correspondent gives a first-hand picture of what France and England are doing along the West Coast.

Rivalry *in* AFRICA

By ARNOLD HÖLLRIEGEL

Translated from the *Berliner Tageblatt*
Berlin Liberal Daily

FOR MORE THAN A QUARTER of a century the rivalry between England and France in Africa has produced many episodes of historic importance. In 1898, the year of the Fashoda incident, war nearly occurred, but an agreement was arrived at which made possible the Entente Cordiale. As a result of this agreement the British and French fought side by side in Africa during the World War and when the spoils of battle were divided at Versailles, England's claims were chiefly localized in East and Southwest Africa, while those of France were concentrated in the west. By relinquishing as mandates to their French allies two-thirds of the German colonies of Togo and Cameroons, the British have acknowledged that France now controls in West Africa a vast and firmly knit colonial empire bordering its North African possessions. As for the English colonies in West Africa, both large and small,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are mere enclaves of this empire, though important ones, and the ancient rivalry still persists under this new arrangement.

Whereas the British West African colonies of Gambia, Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast, Nigeria, and the mandated territories have no unified administration, all of French West Africa is administered by a single governor general with headquarters in Dakar in the territory of Senegal. He controls nine colonies: Senegal, French Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Dahomey, the French Sudan, the Upper Volta, Mauritania, Niger, and the Circle of Dakar and Dependencies. The mandated territory of French Cameroons does not belong to the administrative unit of French West Africa but it provides a means of communication with Lake Chad and thus represents an extraordinarily important supplement to the West African colonial empire. Indeed, this vast realm extends here and there to the Atlantic seacoast, but it is primarily an inland territory, since the largest and most valuable part of the coast is controlled by the great enclaves established by the British and other powers. Almost all the good natural harbors lie within the British colonies, which complicates the most important task the French have undertaken in West Africa—the creation of a mighty state by building a modern system of communications.

BETWEEN French West Africa and French North Africa lies the Sahara Desert, and the great trans-Saharan railway, which is destined to cross this territory, has not progressed beyond the theoretic stage because of a constant argument as to where its two terminals shall be. Is it to start in Algeria or in Morocco? Will it join the Niger at historic Timbuktu or at the progressive city of Bamako? While these decisions are pending, automobiles and airplanes provide communication of a sort wherever the great Niger or Senegal River or the few existing trunk lines fail to serve. Every day, for instance, a French airmail pilot leaves Toulon, arriving that night at Casa Blanca. The next day he flies to Dakar, the capital of French West Africa, which thus becomes a bare three days' journey from Paris. Between Morocco and French Mauritania, however, the planes have to cross the almost uncivilized Spanish colony of Rio de Oro, where Bedouin riders invariably gallop behind them, hoping that they will fall to the ground. But neither the airplane nor the desert type of automobile can compare with the railroad as a means of bringing peaceful conditions to the country at large, and it is the fond hope of French colonial ambition to finish the trans-Saharan railway before the British Cape-to-Cairo route has been completed.

It is also the obvious intention of the French to emulate British methods, which include, among other things, the large-scale promotion of irrigation. Great projects have been formulated and important work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is already under way. Immense dams are being built across the Senegal River and even more extensive ones across the Niger. But the most far-reaching project of all is the Segou Canal. In the vicinity of Bamako, the capital of the French Sudan, it is proposed to divert the water of the Niger in such a way that it will irrigate 750,000 acres of land. It has been calculated that this irrigation will make possible the production of 150,000 tons of cotton a year, and similar projects at the lakes of Pati, Horo, Tole, and Faguibine may open up approximately 120,000 more acres of good cotton-growing country. To carry out these plans large amounts of capital are necessary, but above all it is essential that native labor, the supply of which is inadequate at present, should be attracted. It is the opinion of the French textile industry that the cotton produced in West Africa will be scarcely inferior to the cotton from the British plantations in Egypt and in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

It may be that British West Africa has been more richly endowed by nature than the territory under French administration, but it is also true that up to now the British colonies have been better managed. The French talk of luck whenever they refer to the fabulous mines of manganese which were discovered during the War on the British Gold Coast, or when they speak of the coal mines of Udi in British Nigeria, which have appreciably facilitated the amazing development of the railroads in that particular colony. Yet one cannot attribute solely to luck the fact that the Gold Coast now produces almost three-fifths of the world's cocoa supply. Twenty-five years ago hardly any cocoa plantations existed along the Gold Coast, but like all the other British West African possessions this colony now boasts more striking evidences of economic progress than can be seen in French West Africa. The new harbor of Takoradi on the Gold Coast, a veritable African Singapore, will soon outstrip all other West African harbors, including the French port of Dakar.

A TRAVELER who visits the British West African colonies observes economic ambition flourishing everywhere. No doubt similar energy exists in French West Africa, but there it is subordinated to the military emphasis of French colonial imperialism. In the British colonies one sees almost nothing but native police, while the French colonies form recruiting centres for a powerful colonial army. No one can fail to notice the barracks and fortifications of Senegal or its numerous military establishments. The natives are nurtured in the spirit of war, a spirit much less perceptible in the British colonies. The brilliant new squares and streets of Dakar are full of war memorials which invariably represent a French soldier embracing a native or giving him the right hand of fellowship. The Anglo-Saxon shrinks from such formal displays of black

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and white fraternization and does not carve inscriptions on pedestals describing the negroes as 'citizens,' but this is all part of the official French colonial policy of friendliness toward the natives. Whether the black 'citizen' of France or the 'nigger' of the British colonies meets with more justice in the actual colonial routine remains, however, an open question.

It is the ideal of French colonial policy to educate the natives to become French in speech and thought. The schools, often of excellent quality, make every effort to attract the sons of native dignitaries, and to transform them into black Frenchmen. Already a class of civilized natives is beginning to think in European terms, though the result is not always unqualified admiration for the present system. As is always the case in colonial affairs, the native who is educated along European lines gradually becomes a political problem. A few years ago, for instance, in the colony of Dahomey, where the blood of cannibalistic human sacrifices has hardly had time to dry, a wave of agitation officially designated as Bolshevism broke loose and had to be suppressed by force. As a certain official reporter remarked: 'In Dahomey, Communist agitators found a few adherents who were speedily reminded of their true duty.'

There is no doubt that French colonial policy has done wonders for the negro through education, hygiene, improved administration of justice, and its attempts to extirpate slavery and raise economic standards. The West African negro expressed his gratitude to France on the battlefields of the World War. But people who are controlled by a master are not too scrupulous about maintaining their gratitude. The fate of colonizing nations is to produce by slow and toilsome processes adversaries of the colonial system. What has happened in India will be repeated within a few decades in every quarter of the earth where colored peoples are dominated by white.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americanism is not confined to these United States. It is a world trend of immediate concern to Europeans as well as to ourselves. Here is a typically German interpretation of its workings.

Germany Goes AMERICAN

By THEODOR LÜDDECKE

Translated from the *Revista de Occidente*
Madrid Literary Monthly

AMERICANISM as a concept appears to-day in every European discussion of cultural, economic, and political problems. The predominant political position of America, the direct result of her economic power and industrial expansion, distresses us and obliges us to turn our attention toward this dominant force in all its aspects. Before the War such a concept hardly existed and was not generally formulated until after the German currency had been stabilized. America, who decided the War and who afterward infused new blood into Europe's weary economic system; American industry, which irresistibly penetrates the economic vitals of all nations; America, who holds in her hands the key to the reparations problem, and who, thanks to her economic success, represents a new way of life which she triumphantly carries to other nations; this America feels herself endowed with a new mission.

The various aspects of American life which we discuss as part of the day's news are, for the most part, insufficient. Everyone interprets them differently. The concept of Americanism is, however, relatively clear. Nearly all the men who use the term in Germany have the same fundamental idea of its meaning. They all feel more or less accurately the general intrinsic essence of the American way of life, even though they fall into error in respect to certain details.

Americanism is a topic and a reality. The typical European intellectual, especially the German, who is not actively engaged in business, is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at first inclined to consider Americanism as one of a number of social theories, like Socialism or Communism, which he either defends or repudiates. This attitude, although it may seem sensible, is, in reality, the most ill-founded of any, since it regards Americanism as a topic of the day. Other critics accept Americanism as a fact and overemphasize its cultural aspects. They dislike the predominance of economic impulses, the monotony of American life, its materialism, and so forth.

A German professor of economics said one day, very seriously, 'I reject the books of Henry Ford because they are not scientific.' Naturally, one may reject *a priori* all American tendencies, fold one's arms, and proceed according to antiquated economic principles, but one gets nowhere and merely becomes more than ever a victim of Americanism. We no longer can reject or accept the forms of life that are taking possession of our economic system. We must, instead, try to appropriate their means and methods or we shall simply fall prey to this Americanism and hand over our industries to foreigners. Many economic phenomena which are called American were actually born in Europe, but are sometimes more American than the Americans themselves. This is especially true of those phases of cultural and economic life that rationalization has produced.

We now use the term 'Americanism' to indicate many manifestations that Spengler would explain as merely symptoms of a coming civilization. The cultural side of our life, for instance, is determined by our economic production to a degree hitherto undreamed of, but this production is also infused with a calculating, exact intelligence. Standardization simply arises from an economic principle. Advertisements impress the desire for manufactured goods in the consumer's mind and these goods re-create his life in their own image. Instead of 'natural' cultural forms we have 'artificial' ones made according to rigorously exact calculations. According to Spengler, the dangerous period when mere civilization replaces culture occurs when cold intelligence, that is to say, conscious calculation, replaces creative activity. It is a period that Europe reached long ago.

THE American world was constructed at a time when this process had already commenced in Europe and in consequence Western capitalism developed freely. Hardly anything natural exists in America. From the earliest days American life has submitted in all its forms to economic principles. Tradition thwarted American economy much less frequently than in Europe and for that reason America is more advanced in the methods of civilization and represents a milestone toward which we ourselves are irresistibly advancing. Those who attack Americanism in Germany, and they are not our worst element, are rebelling against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

future civilization, and are seeking without for an enemy that has long existed within. One might venture the paradox that Europe would have Americanized herself, even if America had never existed. Because of his vital force, the American man, as such, is much younger than the European, but in his way of living and working he is much older. He has achieved much more fully than the European the style of life of a late civilization.

What, then, are these forces of Americanism that are assaulting us? Americanism as a power incorporates itself in the modern American man, in his methods, and in the use he makes of those methods. Americans are Europeans who left their native countries for various reasons and took root in a new continent. They carried with them European dexterity, tremendous energy, and a faith in themselves which was born of deep religious feeling. They entered the infinite of American space, a landscape which for all its beauty does not possess that warmth or charm which would invite a man to live within himself. It is vast, cold, and cruel, and stimulates expansion. He who wishes to live in America must make the instinct for conquest the sole motive of his life. American soil invites tireless activity. It asks to be dominated. Anyone who does not work incessantly is annihilated by the sheer size of the country. The American has no time for philosophy or for any thinking except that which concerns his personal destiny. He must cast aside everything which does not represent some immediate practical value. The American continent can only be conquered by work and work has thus become the chief article of American faith. German professors have tried to refute this philosophical system, which goes by the name of 'pragmatism,' but it cannot be refuted, for it is merely the affirmation of one's self in the infinitude of American space.

In countries where too many men are squeezed on too narrow a soil, and where an individual's opportunities do not correspond to his education and activity, one finds highly developed criticism, that well-known hypertrophy of the intelligent brain, mere thinking for the sake of thinking. In such countries one tends to evaluate culture for its own sake without caring whether there are higher altitudes which thought may reach. In Germany, for instance, there is a passion for thinking which has produced a high degree of sterility because our thought is directed toward unimportant affairs. Knowledge has become a terrible burden. What happens when this limits man's capacity for work, when he has too much ballast in his head to perform skilled labor? This was the question which Nietzsche, for the first time, asked German culture. To-day the problem of the value of German culture again presents itself, but much more insistently, for America is calling at the door.

What is this America with which we must deal? Nothing more than an industrial group of boys full of elasticity and life who, trained to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

optimism, humor, and sport, are ready for any task that lies before them. They are not troubled by abstract preoccupations and can rise to any emergency. They may be ignorant, judged by the standards of German professors, but they are well formed, even physically, and in any case are cultivated enough to buy our factories. It is surprising that the American who rises from bricklayer to factory superintendent generally enjoys better physical condition than the corresponding type in other countries. An American attracts attention when he strolls about Berlin. He radiates greater energy. He walks with a more certain step. The American's face is less careworn than ours. In no country in the world do people laugh as much as in the United States. Certainly, the American moves more freely in life; the natural possibilities of his country offer him an almost unlimited field of activity. He encounters no intellectual stumbling-blocks. Some European visitors say that America has no problems. That is not surprising. When a nation is in 'form' both in its public and private economy, when men and conditions are healthy, few problems exist. Such a nation lives intensely. It lives, not only with its head, but with its whole body. That Americans have too much vital force is revealed in their infantile enthusiasms. One is continually surprised by the natural playfulness of the American soul.

I KNOW many German emigrants who depict Americanism as something cold and satanic because they were unable to make their way there. They could not free themselves from their European prejudices. They did not take with them enough vigor. I do not deny that there is monotony in America and that this is the reason why the upper classes there seek a closer union with Europe. It is likewise true that the robust instincts of the pioneer are dying out. But, all things considered, one finds less Pharisaical narrowness in the average American than in his European counterpart. A country of that size inevitably teaches one to think in magnanimous terms. In short, neither Americanism nor the American who parades his Americanism over the whole earth is as cold and calculating as most Germans believe him to be. One cannot succeed as they do without receiving support from the profound depths where conscience borders on religion. Emerson is America's eternal philosopher. The impulses and tendencies of New Thought are based on his writings. His essays have become a sort of Bible for the superior type of American. Emerson was highly praised by Nietzsche not only for his literary style, but for his whole attitude, for Nietzsche felt a close kinship with him because Emerson placed philosophy, science, and art at the service of mankind. Did he not wish to realize the greatest potentialities of existence?

Will Americanism and the German spirit become compatible? Will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they strengthen or weaken each other? An American industrialist might say, 'We have everything we need and more than we can consume. We have great bank accounts, estates, automobiles, yachts, but we lack one thing: time. Our brains are obsessed with production and now we are dragged along by this great organism that we ourselves have made. When we were young we might have wished a different fate, and though we should like to change things now, we cannot do so.'

And so it is. The fantastic productive force of America has been made possible only by a rigorous curtailment of leisure. This is what produces the monotony of the American world. All its productive force is spent in practical work. What is meant by practical work? To produce, sell, export. The American's sole purpose is to serve as a means of such activity, but he is in danger of pouring his most intimate spiritual energy into the task of increasing and bettering the means of life.

When Nietzsche observed the growth of business in Germany during the last years of the past century, he lamented the disappearance of the leisure man needs for spiritual life. Action is worth while in itself, but to what end? In Germany we can work with American methods but we shall ask ourselves more and more insistently, 'Why?' And America asks us the same question: 'You have greater depth, you have had more time to think about life and its purposes. Can you give us, then, a better answer to this question, "Why?" Show us how we should use the technique that we are teaching you. We go to the movies and read piles of newspapers every Sunday, but our best minds are coming to feel the sterility of it all. Have you enough substance to give us a little?'

The more America becomes Europeanized, however, the more her magnificent tempo will be retarded. But America is at present so strong and active that she could very well stand a little more reflection. Germans, on the other hand, are in danger of withdrawing from tangible themes into spiritual speculation. America, therefore, should oblige Germany to lower her spiritual antennæ a little, for they are both searching for a common ideal.

IN THE confusion of economic ideas which reigns in Germany to-day it would be well to hold up as an example the economic spirit which rules America, for the industrial and business side of our life is in a degenerate condition and we need some of the American's sobriety and activity to master a perilous situation. Americans are attacking us on our own soil and one by one are conquering our strategic positions. We should therefore endeavor to remain at least masters of our own house, which we can do by studying American methods and utilizing them for our own benefit as far as conditions permit. Otherwise we can only gain our ends by political subterfuge. Americanism would not have ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vanced so far and so rapidly in Germany if it were not for Versailles and the subsequent German class struggle. Reparations and our endless eagerness to pay provoked that great international credit tension which obliged us, hat in hand, to call continually at America's door asking for loans. Only a radical change in our present system will enable us to combat the advance of America in Germany and to prevent the rest of our economic resources from falling into the hands of the foreigner.

America teaches us that decision, magnitude, activity, and cold calculation in economic matters are not incompatible with romanticism. This is a lesson that Germany needs.

Not world peace but world prosperity is the real aim of Briand's United States of Europe. Here is a sympathetic view of a project that bids fair to rank with the work of Woodrow Wilson.

BRIAND for Europe

By WLADIMIR D'ORMESSON

Translated from *L'Europe Nouvelle*
Paris Foreign-Affairs Weekly

FAITHFUL TO THE MISSION unanimously confided to him at the famous luncheon last September in Geneva, M. Briand sent on the 17th of May to the governments of the twenty-seven European countries the memorandum which is to serve as a basis for a thorough examination of a federal European union. With a courtesy and sincerity that everyone will appreciate he also communicated this document to the non-European states and to those governments not represented at Geneva. Thus an idea that neither praise nor sarcasm can conceal enters the realm of actuality and we must decide whether to reject it or to put it into effect.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The discussion that has now begun constitutes an historic event and marks a date in the evolution of international life. Like the good architect that he is, M. Briand has begun with the foundation. The principles that he lays at the base of his project for federal organization are completely simple. They make an overwhelming appeal to one's reason. They offer so little matter for discussion that they can hardly fail to win universal support. 'The dominating quality of the Briand memorandum is modesty,' a foreign newspaper has remarked. Modesty is the best of political methods and it is not the least courageous, even though it is always the most certain to succeed. Yet there is no use concealing the fact, and M. Briand dissimulates as little as anybody, that any project for a federal union, however opportune it may be, arouses and will continue to arouse lively resistance and serious objections. When a project to bring about collective order is proposed, the reactions it produces are determined first by distrust and secondly by utilitarian interests. Nations will ask what risks the application of such an idea is going to involve and what responsibilities will be incurred. They will then inquire whether it will be to their interests to promote such a scheme, and what tangible benefits they will reap from it. Thus each nation will question itself prudently.

M. BRIAND'S merit is that the suggestions he has offered contain no adventurous elements and reduce to a bare minimum all reasons for apprehension and all sources of controversy. He has clearly stated that a European federation would not menace any other continent, nor would it become a rival to the League of Nations. Article 21 of the Geneva pact states that international engagements, including treaties of arbitration and regional agreements like the Monroe Doctrine which insure the maintenance of peace, are not considered incompatible with any of its own dispositions. Now what is the European federation if it is not a regional agreement, and what is a regional agreement if it is not the best means of securing peace and organizing limited systems within a universal system? The memorandum forcefully insists that the federal tie cannot compromise or weaken the necessary sovereignty of individual states. It is simply a matter of establishing between these states a condition of constant solidarity and permitting them whenever it is necessary to get into immediate contact through an appropriate organization to study, discuss, and regulate problems they have in common.

An important article in the London *Times* recognized that Briand had answered in advance all the objections that might be made except one, and this objection of the *Times* was that the project of a federated Europe could not easily be reconciled with the organization of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Empire. Yet without England the European federation would find itself deprived of a great influence. What is the principal motive for the reserve that the British show toward European politics? It is that these politics appear to people who are disseminated all over the world to represent a constant and dangerous brawl. The rivalries and complications of China are almost incomprehensible to Europeans, and we keep as far away from them as possible. But what do these complications and rivalries amount to compared with the quarrels going on in Europe? It would be a good thing if we searched our own consciences a little more often.

The chief aim of a federal union would be to simplify Europe, to disembroil it, if I may use that expression, to make it look less like a Byzantine court than it now does to so many foreign nations, and thus to remove the sources of the distrust that both Britain and America have felt since the Armistice. Contrary to what most people believe, the existence of a federal European union would tighten the bonds that join our continent to other continents by correcting appreciably the impression of division and disorder that we give to the outer world. Not only would peace be favored but prosperity and greater coördination would also follow.

And here I feel that we touch upon the most important, the most novel, and the most fruitful aspect of M. Briand's suggestion, to wit, that it is more important to organize the well-being of Europe than to organize its peace. In this respect the projected federal union differs fundamentally from the League of Nations. The Geneva pact concerns itself above all with world peace. It outlines to the different members of the League their individual and collective duties. It shows what course to pursue in order to avoid conflicts. If conflicts should then arise it explains what should be done to stop them or to chastise the nation that breaks the law common to all. But the Covenant of the League necessarily steers clear of everything touching the daily peaceful life of its member states. It is, if I may say so, a collective instrument forbidding evil, or at least attempting to forbid it. The League is only a life-giving force in that it opposes itself to death and destruction.

BUT it may well be dangerous to look upon international life purely as a possible source of war. If war is one of the oldest human institutions and if it has for centuries responded to the fundamental needs of mankind, it is to-day, thank God, no longer our only preoccupation. The besetting sin of all alliances and agreements that have been sealed and unsealed in the course of history is that they were never inspired by anything except the idea of war. Rarely have nations come together to improve their way of life. They have only united to defend themselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

better or to make a more effective attack. This state of affairs possesses a certain value to the League of Nations and the League could not have been anything else than what it is since it represents a reaction to the atrocious carnage of the last war. But alongside of the League of Nations, two other organizations exist which respond to this need for a better life and perhaps contain the germ of the real League of Nations of future times. These are the International Labor Bureau and the Institute of Intellectual Coöperation. These bodies find themselves concerned entirely with collective activity and M. Briand wants to develop his European federation along similar lines. It is no longer a question of peace, for peace has its own technique and procedure which need only be perfected. The point now is to discuss a better organized, more coherent, more productive, and thus a happier and richer Continental existence. The European federation will be a means of increasing Europe's prosperity.

The need for well-being does not arise from purely acquisitive motives. It responds to the instincts of life itself. Europe to-day is no longer what it used to be. It has lost, and with good reason, the superb carelessness that five centuries of undisputed leadership inspire. It now finds itself going to rack and ruin. It has lost half its gold and most of its widespread prestige and has unleashed nationalist passions that are now turning against it. If Europe wants to oppose the mortal consequences of the War, retrieve its power of enlightenment, and recover its place in the world it must at once put its house in order. And for that reason it must unify itself.

Although such a labor may involve hideous dangers, although a unified, rationalized Europe may become a kind of gigantic Chicago factory, and although people may say that it would be a hundred times better for us to continue to vegetate as we are, we can only urge such alarmists to calm their delirious imaginations. We in Europe are so far, so prodigiously far, from these dangers that we can well take a little step along the road that leads in their direction with much more advantage than inconvenience.

The same day that M. Briand sent out his questionnaire to the twenty-seven European states M. Tardieu ordered the army on the Rhine to begin evacuating the Mayence zone, since all the conditions of the Hague Protocol had been fulfilled. Germany thus recovered her sovereignty and independence, and her relations with France became normal. The immediate results of the War have been liquidated. Thus the moment has arrived when peace loses its negative character and becomes positive—when it is no longer a matter of repair but of creation. Meanwhile, we French have often been reproached for having cultivated inert ideas and for being static, whereas life itself is dynamic.

I therefore ask whether M. Briand's project is not dynamic in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

true sense of the word? Is it not charged with rich possibilities and innovations? Creative peace can only be achieved by degrees. The first step was the smoothing out of Franco-German relations, for in them lies the nucleus of the European entente. It will be to M. Briand's eternal honor that he understood this fact and that he worked for it tirelessly in France, just as Stresemann gave his life working for it in Germany. Consider the distance covered in the past six years. Observe the methodical development of a policy that has gradually brought order out of chaos and has finally solved the immediate difficulties left by the War. And all this has been done without infringing upon any of the fundamental rights of the parties involved, without touching the established order. Can we deny that this is a work of which M. Briand has every right to be proud?

I KNOW full well the objections that will be raised. I shall be told that we must not confuse our desires with realities, that everything is still uncertain and full of danger in this old Europe of ours. Every effort will be made to call attention to the suspicious insular attitude of England, a sorry reflection indeed on its Labor Government, and I shall also be reminded of certain speeches at Livorno and Florence that nobody, least of all their author, really takes seriously. References will also be made to the huge expenditures on German and Russian armaments. To these objections I shall make two replies. First of all, nobody, not even the most violent partisan, believes that the federal European union can be achieved quickly and easily. The Lord Himself took seven days to make the world and certain delays may well be expected before Europe is bound tightly together. But the important thing is to begin creating the organism which in turn will find its proper function. In the second place, should not all these signs of division and insecurity make us eager to develop a method reducing them to a minimum, if not actually eliminating them altogether? It might well be called a work of social conservation. Yet by a curious paradox the very people who believe themselves conservative are the ones who are opposing these efforts and raising every possible kind of objection to them. Their attitude reminds one of the man who saws off the branch on which he is sitting.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First a member of Max Reinhardt's troupe, then a film star of the first magnitude, and now a legitimate actor again, Emil Jannings speaks with authority on movies, talkies, and the stage.

Why I Left the *Films*

By Emil Jannings

Translated from the *Neue Freie Presse*
Vienna Liberal Daily

WHAT DETERMINED ME to devote my activities to the films for the past few years in preference to the stage was the tremendous amplification that the artist's work and personality find in the movies. This, however, is not the only consideration that has tempted us actors to engage in film work. The theatre is the most perishable of all arts. Its great moments are born in the twinkling of an eye and vanish as rapidly. Suppose, for instance, I am standing on the stage putting all my energies into the part of King Lear. Two or three thousand people are watching me, listening to me, receiving a certain impression, while I feel that I am incorporating myself in my part. True enough, it is a fine sensation, but it lasts for only two or three hours, and when these hours have passed everything has vanished. Nothing remains but a more or less transient memory. Even if I had made the stars in the heavens change their courses, everything ends when the curtain falls, and this fact explains why so many actors say to themselves after a particularly happy performance, 'What you have created to-day in a fleeting moment from a mere ring in your voice you will never again be able to create in all your life.' Each of our successes, each achievement, each satisfying performance makes us remember that to-morrow our garlands may be withered and our hour of triumph passed.

How different it is in the films, where our achievement is recorded for all time as permanently as the printed works of any writer. For the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first time since man ever strode upon a stage the actor at last feels that, with the films, the words 'gone by' hold no more terror for him. These were the artistic considerations that led me to the films. I have no reason to conceal the fact that I also enjoyed many material advantages. The enormous earnings that an artist can gain for himself in the films permit him to lead a life of independence, to assure his future and his old age, and to do whatever gives him pleasure and satisfaction.

But from the standpoint of the actor, as well as from the public's point of view, certain just objections can be made to the silent picture. The actor coming straight from the speaking stage feels these drawbacks particularly keenly. As long as films were silent the spoken words of even the most expert actor lost a good half of their effect and in this way the actor's power was cut in two. I experienced that sensation myself and bent all my energies to correct the deficiency by never acting out my part in silence before the camera. Speech was a necessity to me, an artistic requirement. I remember, for instance, an episode in *The Last Command*. The final scene was laid in the trenches. The director, Herr von Sternberg, and I stood there together, not knowing how my madness should be portrayed. Suddenly I had an inspiration. Grasping a flag in my hand I imagined myself acting the part of King Lear on the heath, and I played this part and spoke its lines just as I have played it on the stage. The public, of course, was not aware of this fact, yet the scene itself, where a Russian grand duke in the trenches spoke King Lear's soliloquy, was the high point of the picture.

THE sound film has now come to my rescue and has solved a number of technical difficulties against which the silent film had to struggle in vain. I remember particularly the perplexing, unsatisfactory effect given by inserting subtitles in the midst of the action. I had always vainly advocated films without subtitles, for when films were exported these subtitles were changed to accord with the taste of the film producers and other officials who did not know their business. Either the translations were idiotic or something quite different was inserted in cases where the original title did not happen to suit some producer or other. 'That is not for our public,' he would say, 'let's have the actor speak some other line.' There was no way of remedying this condition nor was there any way of preventing the producers from cutting out whole scenes and sometimes inserting them again in some other part of the picture.

All this has stopped now. Sound pictures cannot be cut to pieces. They must remain as they were made and cannot be changed or falsified to suit the taste or lack of taste of any vague public. But above and beyond anything else, the sound film spells salvation to actors trained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the theatre. We no longer have to act pantomimes and attempt to work on our public with overdone mimicry to make up for our silence. Moreover, colored and three-dimensional films are likewise being developed. I have already seen such a film projected and had the sensation of witnessing live actors in a real theatre. The three-dimensional film will represent an immeasurable advantage not only to the film industry but to the art of the actor. Yet it is the sound film that really accomplished our salvation, for now we can speak—though speech in the films does not mean that the actor can just begin talking as he pleases. The talking picture is developing an art of its own that is in no sense an art tributary to the theatre, for in the films the visual element still predominates. The audience must first see and then hear.

Not all directors and actors clearly realize this as yet. The talking film still suffers from growing pains and experiments will be made just as they were twenty years ago on the silent pictures. At present, for instance, the idea of sound has proved so fascinating that every opportunity is taken to bring in all kinds of noises, some of which make one's hair stand on end. When a man is shown going upstairs many directors cannot be happy unless the stairs creak just as they do in real life, but I believe that in the new film, entitled the *Blue Angel*, that I have made with Sternberg and Pommer, these growing pains of the sound film have been overcome and that the public can witness in this picture the most advanced achievement yet made.

THERE is no question at all that the talking pictures will endanger the legitimate theatre, but they will harm only bad theatres and therefore there is no cause for lamentation. The big, first-rate theatre will remain, but the little, endlessly tiresome theatres are destined to disappear sooner or later. Anyone would rather stay at home and listen to a record of Caruso than go to hear some mediocre singer perform in person. On the other hand, we gladly renounce even the loveliest phonograph records if we can see or hear some first-rate artist in person at theatre or concert hall. In like fashion, even the three-dimensional colored films represent no danger to the best theatres but only to the mediocre and second-rate stage. In the same playhouses where endless efforts were expended to put on some elaborate performance, a man will appear some fine day with nothing but a few rolls of film in his pocket and these will enable the public to see and hear first-rate representations of *King Lear* or *Carmen*.

One figure will definitely vanish—the type known as the star, a product of the silent film pure and simple. There is only one man I do not need to hear in the talking pictures but whom I hope to see in many more silent films, and that is Chaplin. He is the one artistic genius whose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mysterious quality would perhaps vanish if he gave up that eloquent silence of his which speaks with a thousand voices. In America the talking pictures have by no means destroyed the legitimate stage, but then there are no bad theatres over there. Only the theatres presenting revues have suffered, for the sound pictures offer everything that the revues contain on a much greater scale and, moreover, they cost only fifty cents or a dollar to see, whereas one has to pay as much as fifteen dollars to get an ordinary seat to a good revue.

The talking picture offers good actors an immense opportunity. Stars who owed their success entirely to good looks and a few gestures are disappearing. Already the most talented and interesting actors from the New York stage are going into the films. Anyone in our profession with real ability need not worry about his future. But first of all he must decide whether he will work in the talking pictures or in the theatre. I believe that a division of labor is impossible. Neither the film nor the theatre gets what it deserves if actors spend their days working in studios and their evenings performing on some stage. I followed this rule myself when I was acting in the films and never appeared in the theatre, for whatever a man does he must do thoroughly and with undivided energy. Work in the talking pictures, like work on the stage, can only be successfully pursued by concentrated effort. One should not cast sheep's eyes at some similar form of art. The thing to do is to stand firmly on the ground that one has chosen.

I have been stirred to the depths by the greeting that has been given me by Vienna and the Viennese. I have had wide experience in celebrations, especially in America, the land of superlatives. My arrival in New York and the reception I was given in Hollywood will always remain in my memory as impressive experiences. But the way this old theatrical city of Vienna greeted me makes me say that I have never lived through such joyous days. One day in particular I recall—the twenty-first of March—when I fulfilled the promise I had made to my friend Dr. Beer to make my first appearance on the stage here in Vienna after so many years in the films. I shall never forget that evening. Stage fright almost throttled me as I walked out from the wings, for it was six years since I had appeared in a theatre and when the public burst into its storm of applause I was hardly able to speak. Such high expectations demanded a great performance and I brought every effort to bear not to disappoint the Viennese.

And on that occasion, when everything was going so well, I felt as never before that I must return to the legitimate theatre. It would be the greatest satisfaction to me if these lovely days I have spent in Vienna could be continued somehow or other, and I hope that some permanent arrangement can be made with the Burg Theatre so that part of the time that I shall retain each year for the speaking stage will bring me to Vienna.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS AND THE ARTS

Two New Academicians

THE FRENCH ACADEMY of Forty Immortals has reached its full quota by electing André Chaumeix to fill the chair of Georges Clemenceau and Charles Le Goffic to fill the chair of François de Curel. As leading editorial writer on *Le Figaro*, M. Chaumeix occupies a powerful position in the French press and our readers may recall a recent comment of his on America and the Soviets that we translated in the 'As Others See Us' department of our June first issue. Born in 1874, M. Chaumeix studied both literature and law and began his literary work as editor of the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*. Soon, however, his interest shifted more to politics and he became literary and political editor of the *Journal des Débats* in 1901 and editor in chief in 1905. Since that time he has served as literary critic for *Le Gaulois* and the *Revue des Deux Mondes* and as editor of the *Revue de Paris*. The *Nouvelles Littéraires* describes him as having 'too much elegance of bearing and too much distinction of mind to suffer from a comparison with Clemenceau himself. The great symbolic powers of our time, money and honors, have interested him much more as an observer than as a partisan.'

M. Le Goffic also has a literary record, but one that is a little more removed from the hurly-burly of political life. Furthermore, his qualifications for immortality seem to have been somewhat dubious as three ballots had to be held before he won a majority over the other contenders for his seat, whereas M. Chaumeix's name received five times as many votes as his one opponent, Maurice Larrouy, whose impressions of America and of China have also appeared in The Living Age. Eleven years older than M. Chaumeix, M. Le Goffic has written some forty books including histories, novels, collections of verse, and dramatic pieces. He is a native of Brittany and an ardent patriot, having produced considerable propaganda during the War. He spent about ten years teaching and before being elected to the Academy he occupied the presidency of the Société des Gens de Lettres.

Twenty-Five Years of Chesterton

MR. G. K. CHESTERTON has just completed a quarter of a century's service with the *Illustrated London News*, to which he has contributed an essay a week, with only two breaks, ever since 1905. The long association fills him with pride, for he regards the '*I. L. N.*' as a paper of real educational value, since it is not, as he says, 'stuffed with dogs and duchesses.' He is less happy, however, about modern standards of journalism, which, he claims, do not compare with those that prevailed when he was a younger and a thinner man:—

> The Fleet-Street journalist of the old days was not a snob, though he may sometimes have been a blackguard. He often dressed in the roughest clothes and drank in the lowest taverns, but his idea of the nature of a controversy was far more logical and coherent than that which prevails to-day, and he did produce clear-cut and connected arguments. When I fought with, say, Bernard Shaw or Blatchford, we did at least know what each of us stood for. We started with a fundamental hypothesis which both sides understood, and we were quite sure of what we were fighting about. But in many of the journalistic controversies we have now there is a vagueness and looseness which seems to begin in nothing and end nowhere.
>
> There is so much dealing in mere impressions and suggestions, with an almost total absence of reference to anything that could be called a first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principle. Somebody says, for instance, that Mr. MacDonald may decide to do this, or Mr. Hoover is expected to do that. But nobody writes as if it mattered very much whether they did it or not. That is the principal line of cleavage, I think, between the new journalist and the old. To the journalist of twenty-five years ago it would have mattered very much indeed whether one policy were adopted or another. What emerges now in most discussions on political, philosophical, or religious problems is seldom a definite argument at all, but a sort of detached nature study.

This lack of purpose Mr. Chesterton attributes to the 'wide chasm of skepticism in modern society' which is due chiefly to a lack of religious faith:—

> When men had some recognized basis of religion or philosophy to refer to, an Imperialist might justly exclaim to a Socialist, 'I think that your attempt to blow up the King is highly un-Christian,' and the Socialist could retort, 'I consider that your policy of annihilating niggers is abominable.' Then each man would have to defend his own principles. But nowadays, with the decay of strong convictions of faith or morals, all that is left for the Imperialist to say is, 'You brute of a Socialist,' and for the other to reply in similar terms. Then the argument comes to an abrupt conclusion.

As an ardent convert to Roman Catholicism, Mr. Chesterton himself cannot be said to suffer from the modern curse of unbelief. Yet his preoccupations have become noticeably less serious since he has seen the light. He now devotes a great amount of time to inventing new murder stories and trying to discover fresh places to hide the corpse. Meanwhile, Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, and other unrepentant cronies of his salad days continue to find the problems of the modern world sufficiently engrossing to demand their whole attention.

Tagore in Paris

FRESH FROM INDIA and filled to bursting with its lyrical wisdom, Rabindranath Tagore has come to Paris to supervise an exhibition of his pictures while his compatriot, Gandhi, serves time in jail. 'Look at my paintings,' he exclaimed to the awe-struck M. Pierre Lagarde, interviewer from *Comœdia*. 'I obey no method. They follow no doctrine. Impulse alone suffuses them. Each subject carries its own manner with it. Look at my paintings.' M. Lagarde looked. 'They are multiple, strange, striking,' he reports. 'Here is a blue forest. Here are pigeons kissing. Here is a crowd of faces, a tangle of animals, a pullulation of naïve colors and simplified lines. One is at first astonished by something hallucinating and primitive, something that is perhaps merely the brutal confidence of a soul and an eye.' But the painter seemed even more striking than his pictures:—

> I am standing in front of Rabindranath Tagore. His calm, impassive face possesses the warm gravity of an Oriental garden. It seems that deep secrets dwell in that lofty, smooth, arched forehead over which falls an avalanche of white hair reaching to his shoulders. A prophetic beard lengthens his immobile features, which are bathed in immense serenity. His clear gaze seems to be the echo of an attentive, contemplative soul. Each gesture of his peaceful hands looks as if he were caressing some invisible dream. I am standing before the poetry and wisdom of the Orient.

When M. Lagarde tried to ask a few questions he confesses that 'Rabindranath seemed to reply only to himself.' However, here are the latest nuggets of wisdom that the unchanging East has to offer:—

'At eighteen,' explained Tagore, 'poetry was first revealed to me. At eighteen, while I was watching the sun rise over a forest. The trees were illuminated and transmitted the light to my soul. What life, what warm and powerful magic! But how describe it? Words are so old. What vigor lives in their worn-out shapes? Reality. For poetry is not merely a dream. It is a living reality.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Inside us,' queried his pert interviewer, 'or outside us?'

'Both,' replied the broad-minded sage. 'I envisage inspiration as a message and poetry as a response of one's self to the universe. How could it be purely introspective? Is it not a permanent communion with the great world of truth? And is there not a single plan underlying all the different forms of truth? The magician, inspiration, comes to us by many routes. Sometimes a powerful thought haunts us. Sometimes the words come first and gradually take the form of a thought. There is no system, only innumerable different systems. So much of this, so much of that. Nobody knows. Preconceived method is always a weakness.'

After uttering these winged words Tagore bowed and, magician that he is, vanished.

Baseball in Japan

ALTHOUGH JAPAN is one of the few countries outside the North American continent where baseball has become a popular sport, the game had a hard time getting started. To-day, for instance, Meiji Shrine Park near Tokyo is being enlarged because its seating capacity of 30,000 has proved inadequate, yet there was a time when no admission was charged and the spectators had to be given free tea and cakes during the seventh inning in order to be kept from going home. The *Japan Advertiser* has printed a quaint account of the early days of baseball in Japan, written in inimitable English by Suyeo Nakano, who describes how two American professors introduced the sport in 1873:—

> Their disciples were soon reinforced by Marquis Kimimasa Kido, heir of one of the three Restoration heroes, and Count Nobuaki Makino, former Foreign Minister and now Lord Privy Seal. Marquis Kido and Count Makino studied in the United States. Marquis Kido brought a ball from the States. He used it with great care until it was broken. He immediately dissected it for imitation. A shoemaker ordered to make up balls made ball-making his side line. Almost simultaneously Count Satotaka Tokugawa, former Lord Chamberlain, organized the first baseball team in Japan. It was named the Hercules team. He ordered a carpenter to make a bat. He made it of paulownia wood of regular grain. When one of the team struck a ball with that bat it was instantly broken into two.

Many Japanese who have since become famous took up the game ardently, among them a former foreign minister, a former chancellor of the Imperial University at Tokyo, the present governor of the South Manchurian Railway, and a distinguished member of the House of Peers. Sometimes the early teams on which these men played practised by night and when rain fell the players would appear in straw raincoats, leggings, and straw sandals. One team used to wear only loin cloths during the hot weather and would protect their feet with wooden sandals. Their playing equipment was also primitive. Railway employees were encouraged to take up the game, whereupon the factories from which these railways bought their material were asked to supply balls, bats, and bases. The catcher's mask, however, proved too much of a problem, although merchants of fencing masks were told to get this new form of protective armor on the theory that baseball was a Western form of fencing. More than a hundred runs were sometimes scored in the early games and the batters, according to Mr. Nakano, 'assumed the offensive three or four times in one inning.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AS OTHERS SEE US

America Threatens Britain

DR. FRITZ KLEIN, editor of the reactionary *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, has written a book called *Thirteen Men Rule Europe* in which he discusses, among other things, the rivalry between England and the United States. Here is part of what he has to say:—

As to Anglo-American relations, it cannot be denied that there is deep and serious discord between London and Washington, and the state of mind which prevailed between the great Anglo-Saxon powers prior to the Naval Conference may perhaps be compared to the relations between England and Germany at the turn of the century. The United States of America is contesting the British mastery of the seas. It is resuming—bitter irony—the struggle for the freedom of the seas. But it is not asking for a 16:10 ratio of naval strength as Germany once did; it is asking for parity. New York has taken London's place as the first money market of the world, and in Europe Paris is rising to first place. With a sharp eye on the Monroe Doctrine American financiers are encroaching on Central and South America by strong-arm methods, and one by one these states are being, if not occupied by the military, at least financially and economically divided up by their big neighbor to the north. The United States is the first country to recognize the new order in China, and the Americans like their country to be considered China's best and most valuable friend. During President Hoover's administration American policy toward China, which was radically changed by the abrogation of former treaties, will without any question be strengthened. American foreign trade is entering into the sharpest competition with British commerce in the Far East as well as in South America, and, incredible as it may seem, in Australia and New Zealand. Russian overtures are coolly received in Washington, but that does not hinder American business men from taking an interest in Russian investments and outstripping the English in the struggle for oil. The United States is immeasurably rich and, even apart from its position as a creditor nation, is able to increase its armaments without limit, which England cannot do. The question arises as to whether a new race in armaments on a gigantic scale is not about to occur, and whether the struggle for markets will not culminate in a decision by arms. The United States is to-day geographically unassailable and could with a single blow cut the ties that bind the dominions to the British mother country and deal Great Britain a death blow.

Maxse Comes Back

FOR THE PAST SIX MONTHS illness has prevented Mr. Leo J. Maxse, editor of the *National Review*, from supplying this department—all unconsciously—with some of its most refreshing material. No British journalist uses the King's English more effectively than this stanch Tory, and few journalists of any country express themselves with more honesty, courage, and enthusiasm. We therefore welcome his return to health and wish him more power to his elbow, for we have every conviction that his active survival will do wonders in promoting that sense of Anglo-American friendship which he so eloquently deplores. His most recent effusion, based on a debate in the House of Lords during which many speeches attacking the Naval Treaty were made, contains one especially cordial paragraph:—

The only risk of such debate is that the United States senators would be much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more likely to ratify this undesirable treaty, which they also are debating, if they were convinced that England would be crippled thereby. They are almost uniformly hostile to England and the amicable sentiments toward America which form part of the stock in trade of our public men have no counterpart in America. We ourselves can imagine no better way of exacerbating American dislike of England than the recently terminated Naval Conference, and no way more likely to create a hostile feeling to America than the so-called pacifist policy of yardstick measurements. Anything more likely to irritate and annoy than the discussions going on on both sides of the Atlantic we cannot conceive, and yet these discussions are an inevitable outcome of the Conference. For such agreements must be known and discussed and everyone knew beforehand that this was so. No repetition of our friendly sentiments toward America will get over this, no speeches on this side about war being 'unthinkable' will placate the Americans. War with the British Empire is very seriously considered by them, and their fleet manœuvres are said to be frequently based on the supposition of such a war.

It would be interesting to know what possible adversary in the western Atlantic figures in the manœuvres of the British fleet and even more interesting to discover how Mr. Maxse, lying on his bed of pain, acquired first-hand knowledge of the motives of American senators.

A Belgian Sees New York

MAURICE VAN MOPPÈS, whose name indicates Belgian ancestry, has returned from a visit to New York with a series of pen and ink drawings which have been published in *Le Crapouillot* of Paris along with the author's verbal impression of the metropolis of the West. Here are some of his more striking paragraphs:—

The arrival at New York, majestic though it is, seems less truly grand than one would at first expect. Far different is Venice seen from the sea! After all, these huge skyscrapers are no more than a pile of little stories with tiny windows, and they look more like honeycombs than Babylonian constructions. To be fair, however, one must admit that these buildings, as one sees them on a sunny morning, rising from a sea filled with all manner of ships, this hive from which rises a mighty roar, is far better than the filling stations, hot-dog stands, and concessions which spoil the approach to Paris.

On the street corners young ruffians lean against drug-store windows chewing gum. And this scene recalls a folk lore already old, for we are acquainted with these ruffians and this old man who opens his window and whistles to someone below; we have seen them in the earliest detective films, in 'The Mysteries of New York,' and, if we are old enough, we have met them in the *Nick Carter* books, those amazing adventure stories.

There is no doubt about it, in this house they are gagging a beautiful blonde, and in that one the police are about to raid an opium den in which an aged banker is lying with bloody temple, while a well-dressed bandit is escaping through a subterranean passage leading to some Fifth Avenue apartment.

But, alas, we must turn a new leaf, for these scenes of crime are now inhabited by the most bourgeois of families. Every evening at the same time they turn on their handsome radios, whence the voice of Rudy Vallee flows like sirup.

American Girls in Vienna

NO EUROPEAN CITY has been spared the invasion of American flappers and Vienna with all its charms has become familiarized at first hand with every style of young womanhood from overseas. A contributor to the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* gives the following description of two common types:—

Dorothy is unbelievably beautiful, stylish, and refined, and looks as if she were wealthy. The Viennese gentleman

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who looks at her and listens to her is already convinced that she is the dollar princess for whom he has been waiting and that he is the dream of an American maiden's heart. But Dorothy never concerns herself with admirers either American or foreign. Business is business, each must look out for himself, and any mixing of shares should be avoided at any cost. This type of girl appears to lose all need for expansion when she adopts her ultra-slender girlish figure and lays aside the pliant feminine form.

As to so many others of her type, man is to Dorothy only a means of satisfying her desire for luxury and more luxury, and when her shopping is done she dismisses him. The Don Juan conception grows pale before the idol of this new kind of girl. Don Juan was forever seeking the ideal woman, and cast one after another aside as not coming up to his conception; Donna Dorothy has crossed love and feeling off her programme. Only business remains of value to her. Flirting requires no skill when one is pretty, but it becomes an art when one uses it to achieve all one's wishes, down to the most expensive fur coat, and at the same time remains unapproachable to one's fingertips.

Joyce, who is studying at the music school here in Vienna, is a big brunette. On occasion she can adopt a refined elegance, but usually she is just a nice middle-class girl. She lives in an old patrician house far up on Himmelpfort Street with a once well-to-do family from whom she has rented two rooms. She has the faculty of gathering people about her, and at least once a week gives a party for all her old friends and many new ones. There are music and jolly games, and couples sit chatting in corners. Everyone brings along some food, and Joyce, whose hands are as skillful in the kitchen as at the piano, concocts a marvelous supper. There are always interesting types here. An Irish-American tells of the World War on the Mesopotamian front, someone else has come from Japan not long since, and that black-eyed, dark-haired girl over there is from Hawaii. Joyce manages this motley crowd beautifully, and both she and everyone else have a lovely time. But in spite of her talent and masculine organizing ability, she is romantic through and through. She is waiting and hoping for the man with whom she can throw in her lot and to whom she can belong.

Robeson as Othello

THE BRITISH PRESS has greeted with the greatest enthusiasm the appearance of Paul Robeson in *Othello*. Here is what the highly unemotional *Morning Post* had to say of his performance:—

There is, of course, no need to apologize for Mr. Robeson because he is a negro. Though in conventional grace and some niceties of diction we have had English Othellos from whom he might learn, there has been no Othello on our stage, certainly for forty years, to compare with his in dignity, simplicity, and true passion. He made the part sympathetic and appealing, not only because he was more real, but also because together with his deep, virile voice there was a childlike racial simplicity that made Othello's submission to Iago's suggestions understandable and the 'pity of it' not only poignant but also logical. The slight American accent is a trouble at first, but one soon gets used to this. In general, from an elocutionary point of view, one only wishes some of our actors could take example from his rolling and natural response to the rhythm and beauty of Shakespeare's verse.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

THE Honorable Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior in President Hoover's Cabinet, has written us a letter which not only expresses a keen interest in our work, which we much appreciate, but which accurately and sympathetically interprets the aims of THE LIVING AGE. We are sure that our other friends will share our gratification in what Mr. Wilbur has to say:—

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
WASHINGTON, D. C.

TO THE EDITOR:—

I think that you are making a success of THE LIVING AGE in so far as its presentation of important information in an interesting and readable form is concerned. There is no doubt in my mind that we are in the early stages of closer world understanding and cooperation. While I think that some such phrases as 'internationalism' and the rather indiscriminate use of the word 'peace' have been unfortunate and misleading, nevertheless a definite interlocking of the world's economic, social, and political interests is well on its way.

Vital in this process is the understanding of the peoples of one nation by those of another. Since this is impossible to bring about to any degree by personal contact, such a magazine as THE LIVING AGE is of the greatest value, particularly among those who are inclined to take an intellectual point of view.

Congratulating you,

Very sincerely yours,
RAY LYMAN WILBUR

Our friend, the Reverend Edward Welton Perry, of Goldendale, Washington, agrees with the present editors of THE LIVING AGE that the magazine may best serve its mission by a somewhat close adherence to its early traditions. Dr. Perry also suggests a plan which has frequently been in our mind: namely, that there should be included in each issue of THE LIVING AGE one article in the foreign text. We are well aware, of course, that our audience, to a far greater extent than that of any other American magazine, is equipped to enjoy untranslated items, but up to the moment the matter has remained upon the shelf of indecision. As THE LIVING AGE is published in a spirit of personal service to its subscribers, as well as of dedication to the broader cause of improved international understandings, the editors would be interested in any reactions to Dr. Perry's suggestion which our friends would care to express. His letter follows:—

TO THE EDITOR:—

Allow me to express my appreciation of your latest change in appearance, and your retention of the primary aim of your magazine. THE LIVING AGE has a definite place, I believe, which it can best fill by adherence to its original intentions.

Several times it has occurred to me to make one suggestion as to contents. Would it be inappropriate to include in each issue one article in the original French, German, Spanish, or Italian, as the case might be? This could be short and particularly chosen so as not to interfere with the primary purpose of the magazine. I believe that there are enough of your readers who can make use of at least one foreign language to appreciate such a policy. This article could be translated or not as conditions might demand. This may be inadvisable but is well worth thinking about.

As ever your well wisher,
EDWARD WELTON PERRY

From another correspondent has come a much appreciated letter. Mr. Charles B. Bennett, of 1711 Columbia Terrace, Peoria, Illinois, finds in the present LIVING AGE the qualities which produce in the minds of its readers a sense of proprietorship in the enterprise. This is a sentiment to which THE LIVING AGE will always be keenly responsive, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Bennett may be assured that his suggestion for a double-column page, instead of a single-column page, will receive sympathetic consideration. Mr. Bennett writes:—

To the Editor:—

Just a word of comment from a man over sixty.

When you gave us the beautiful illustrated pages I said, 'I don't see how it can be done. I fear we have lost our Living Age.' Then when you turned modernistic I was sure we had lost our Living Age. But as I pick up the current issue with its refined cover I think perhaps we have not lost our Living Age—the Living Age we felt a kind of ownership in. One more slight change or perhaps two would make it more readable than ever before and more in harmony, I believe, with the tastes of the men who read it—a double-column page with the same size of type as at present and headings for main articles in as dignified a style as the new cover design.

Yours truly,
Charles B. Bennett

Another correspondent, this one from the far West, expresses admiration for the present format, though lingering regret for some of the items that made the older Living Age 'such a joy.' Nevertheless, the last sentence of the letter subjoined referring to the present Living Age is especially appreciated.

San Diego, California

To the Editor:—

I have just opened the April 1st, 1930, number and I write to express my appreciation of the change. Last September when the first number of the then new form came I was elated; we had a celebration in our home in seeing the Living Age smaller, less bulky than the former format. But even then we could not bring ourselves to writing you. It was still not the simple, beautiful thing we had grown to love in the years. And now you have gone one step nearer to the old Living Age: the simple lovely thing that brought profit and power with every number. And I am inclined to think that even now there is still something more to expect: the smaller, double-column, comradelike, intimate thing—I hesitate to call it magazine—with tidbits of facts and figures as well as opinion that made the older Living Age such a joy. I do congratulate you upon the change and I can now say again to myself and my friends: 'The Living Age is one of the last magazines I shall part with wherever my lot finds me.'

Sincerely yours,
Constantine Panunzio

We are gratified to have a letter from a recent subscriber who is so pleased by our typography that some of our articles are read as much for the beauty of our print as for interest in the subjects discussed. We are made happy, of course, by the knowledge that our friends respond to the careful study which has been given to type, paper, and format, but we hope that as the years pass Miss Barnes will find herself enthralled by our merits and charms until she becomes blissfully unconscious of our beauty of form. In renewing a short-term subscription Miss Barnes writes:—

281 Fourth Avenue
New York City

To the Editor:—

Yes, please, keep on coming. Much to my surprise I send you herewith a check for six dollars. Dearly as I have come to love you I did not think that when it came to paying for a whole year at once I would really come through.

It is mostly your beautiful printing. I read pages of things that do not specially interest me, just because your pages are so good-looking. My copies are sent on to two young things in China who also enjoy them very much.

Sincerely,—and this needs no reply,—
Gladys W. Barnes

Mr. Clarence M. Lewis, former counsel to the New York Transit Commission, suggests that The Living Age could serve its purposes even better as a monthly magazine than in its present semimonthly form. Other readers have made the same suggestion and our own mind is still quite open on the subject. We give Mr. Lewis's letter in full, not because it is the only one we have received, but because it sums the matter up clearly and concisely.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

43 CEDAR STREET
NEW YORK CITY

TO THE EDITOR:—

It is an open secret, of course, that THE LIVING AGE has not paid expenses for many years and is, in a sense, exploiting the idealism of those connected with it, who serve in the broad cause of better international understandings upon which the peace of the world must ultimately depend. The magazine at present, in format, type, paper, and in other related details is very delightful, and, in matters of substance, the articles are well selected and are intelligently introduced and supplemented by the original departments.

But I have sometimes felt in looking through one of your semimonthly numbers that it did not carry quite enough of its kind of material, by reason of which it has been unable to strike enough chords at the same time.

I believe the merit of a periodical is more frequently judged by its single issues than by the survey of a series of numbers and, if each number of THE LIVING AGE could be added to in volume, the result would be greater variety, a better balance and rounding out of each number of the magazine. By such considerations the merit of your enterprise will be tested, especially by new subscribers.

I would personally favor an increase in volume of THE LIVING AGE, even though the result was that the magazine should reach me once a month, instead of semimonthly.

In point of fact, the composite subscriber of THE LIVING AGE is probably a person past the first flush of youth, for whom the weeks and months fly by with incredible rapidity and who would, I believe, enjoy greater variety of topic with a completer balance and more perfect rounding out of each number than is possible under the present semimonthly publication scheme.

Please do not think that I mean to be critical of the present LIVING AGE. I have high admiration for it, because THE LIVING AGE renders a unique cultural and international service, in the doing of which it supplies material, which, in the combination presented, is nowhere else available in the world.

With best wishes, believe me,

Yours faithfully,

CLARENCE M. LEWIS

Other expressions of opinion upon the point made by Mr. Lewis will be welcomed by the editors.

THE GUIDE POST

(*Continued*)

in a world that instinctively wants peace, must gain the world's respect not only for its physical force but for its moral fairness. In other words, why should a nation not be judged by the same standards by which one judges a gentleman? That there is a good deal of truth in what Tagore says is evidenced by the increasing respect which nations are paying to world public opinion. It is hardly necessary to add that in this article the nation in question is England, and, to a lesser extent, all the nations of the West.

'RARELY have nations come together to improve their way of life,' says WLADIMIR D'ORMESSON, a French political observer always worth listening to, in his article, BRIAND FOR EUROPE. He argues that the true justification of M. Briand's proposed United States of Europe is the furtherance of Europe's economic well-being; for, like an increasing number of observers and statesmen, he considers economic health the prerequisite to political peace.

WHEN a great German actor goes to Hollywood to exchange his pot of beer for a pot of gold, and then returns to Europe with his 'future and old age assured,' how does he explain matters to the European public he deserted? WHY I LEFT THE MOVIES is the title; EMIL JANNINGS the actor; Vienna the audience; and the *Neue Freie Presse* the stage from which he speaks.

IN VAIN do French diplomats at international conferences point self-justifying fingers at France's vast colonial empire and make motions of defense. The French Empire remains more than ten times as large as France itself; but for the rest of the world only the British have any real imperial existence. ARNOLD HÖLLRIEGEL, a widely respected German correspondent, tells in RIVALRY IN AFRICA a little of what France's unrecognized efforts are accomplishing in that part of the world, and also where the British stand.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED